

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XVII

March • 1939

No. 3

PRIMO DE RIVERA:

Benevolent Dictator

JOSEPH DE MAISTRE:

Freemason and Ultramontane

RICHELIEU:

Politics versus Religion

WILFRID AND THEODORE:

A Struggle for Primacy

Book Reviews

Pictorial Forgeries

25c a Copy

\$1.00 a Year

HISTORY IS PHILOSOPHY HISTORY IS THE PRESENT

WHAT DOES SOUND PHILOSOPHY
PRONOUNCE ON THESE AND OTHER
TENETS OF BENEDETTO CRUCE?
READ THE MARCH ISSUE

— OF —

THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN

A Quarterly Journal of Philosophy
St. Louis University

Sample Copy
On Request

Copy— .25
Year—1.00
—in U. S.

SCHOLASTICISM SPEAKS MODERN ENGLISH IN THE SCHOOLMAN

MAKE HISTORY INTERESTING

By

Supplementary readings in
selected historical fiction

See

■ Historical Fiction List ■

20c (mimeo)

.....

THE
HISTORICAL BULLETIN

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

ST. LOUIS, MO.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Includes the following Schools and Colleges and Affiliated Institutions

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

College of Arts and Sciences.....	221 North Grand Blvd.
College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant.....	Florissant, Mo.
Graduate School.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Divinity.....	St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas
School of Medicine.....	1402 S. Grand Blvd.
School of Law.....	3642 Lindell Blvd.
School of Philosophy and Science.....	3638 Lindell Blvd.
School of Dentistry.....	3556 Caroline Street
School of Commerce and Finance.....	3674 Lindell Blvd.
School of Education and Social Science.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Nursing:	

1. St. Mary's Hospital Unit.....1101 Bellevue Avenue
2. University Unit.....1402 South Grand Boulevard

THE CORPORATE COLLEGES

Fontbonne College.....	Wydown and Big Bend Bvds.
Maryville College.....	Meramec and Nebraska Avenues
Webster College.....	Lockwood Blvd., Webster Groves, Missouri
Notre Dame Junior College.....	Ripa Avenue, South Saint Louis
Saint Mary's Junior College.....	O'Fallon, Missouri

THE HOSPITALS

1. UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Hospital.....Clayton and Bellevue Avenues
- (b) Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1325 South Grand Blvd.
- (c) Mt. St. Rose Sanatorium.....9101 South Broadway

2. AFFILIATED HOSPITALS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital.....3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. Anthony's Hospital.....Grand Blvd. and Chippewa
- (c) St. John's Hospital.....307 South Euclid Avenue

3. STAFF-RELATED HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Infirmary.....1536 Papin Street
- (b) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit I.....1550 Lafayette Ave.
- (c) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit II.....2945 Lawton Ave.
- (d) St. Louis City Sanitarium.....5300 Arsenal Street
- (e) St. Louis Isolation Hospital.....5800 Arsenal Street

AFFILIATED NURSING SCHOOLS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital School of Nursing—
3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. Mary's Hospital School of Nursing.....East St. Louis, Ill.

THE OUT-PATIENT SERVICES

1. THE UNIVERSITY OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENT
Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1325 South Grand Boulevard
2. THE ASSOCIATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS
 - (a) Alexian Brothers' Dispensary.....3933 South Broadway
 - (b) St. John's Dispensary.....312 North 23rd Street

THE STAFF-RELATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

- (a) City Dispensary.....1550 Lafayette Avenue
- (b) The Obstetric Dispensaries
St. Louis Obstetrical Hospital Association
St. Ann's Foundling Asylum
- (c) The Pre-Natal Clinics
The Cass Avenue Clinic
The Bethesda Dispensary

WHITE HOUSE

- St. Louis House of Retreats—
White House, Jefferson Barracks P. O., Missouri

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. Price: 25c a copy; \$1.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933.

VOL. XVII

MARCH, 1939

No. 3

Table of Contents

COUNT JOSEPH DE MAISTRE	RAYMOND CORRIGAN	47
PRIMO DE RIVERA	MARIE R. MADDEN	49
EDITORIALS		51
RICHELIEU	SISTER M. PURISSIMA REILLY	53
WILFRID AND THEODORE	HENRY W. CASPER	55
PICTORIAL FORGERIES	HAROLD J. MCAULIFFE	61
BOOK REVIEWS		63

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the Catholic Magazine Index of *The Catholic Bookman*

De Maistre: Freemason and Ultramontane

Raymond Corrigan, S. J., Ph. D.

St. Louis University

COUNT JOSEPH DE MAISTRE was an enthusiastic Freemason. In 1788 he presented a memorial to the Duke of Brunswick, Grand Master of the Masons, urging him to take the lead in restoring religion throughout the world. The same Count de Maistre was the "Father of Ultramontanism," a hardy, fearless and brilliant protagonist of papal infallibility, a champion of the rights of God against all the disintegrating forces of Revolutionary France and, in 1819, the author of a classic work, *du Pape*. De Maistre the ardent Freemason was thirty-four in 1788; de Maistre the Ultramontane was sixty-five in 1819. But the contrasts and apparent contradictions that filled his life and bewilder his critics are not explained by circumstances of age, maturity or internal evolution. Between the polar dates above cited the French Revolution had run its violent and turgid course. The European scene had changed. De Maistre, the defender of high principles, remained what he had always been, fallible to be sure, but essentially consistent.

Without wishing to labor the paradoxical, we may pause to observe that the Vatican Council "canonized" a contention of de Maistre which had exasperated his Gallican contemporaries by erecting papal infallibility into a dogma just half-a-century after *du Pape* was published, while on the other hand Leo XIII in his effort to break French Catholic servitude to an exaggerated and debilitating Royalism found himself face to face with the still dominant influence of de Maistre. But the Council which approved his major thesis placed little reliance on his arguments; in fact many of the assembled fathers were quite impatient with his method and with many of his ideas. And if Leo may be said to have repudiated the Old Régime spirit of de Maistre, the great encyclicals are enough to prove the pope an admirer and, to a degree,

a disciple of the Ultramontane philosopher. De Maistre's *volte face*, if it be such, on the Masonic question has its obvious explanation, which will be touched upon later.

Joseph Marie Comte de Maistre was born on April 1, 1754 (or was it 1753?), at Chambéry in Savoy. He died at Turin on February 26, 1821. He was the eldest of ten surviving children in a home brightened by the presence of a young mother, at once brilliant, scholarly and serious. "Ma sublime mère" he used to call her. She was "an angel to whom God had given a body," and it was his delight, he further informs us, to "divine beforehand her wishes and commands." Later in life his idea of heaven was to have before his eyes, in the person of his wife, "a being made happy by me." His daughter, Constance, whom he described as "the orphan child of a living father," was the third in a peerless feminine trinity which smoothed and softened his rugged career. Mme. de Staël and her salon, as well as the great ladies of the Russian court were also to influence a character which needed the stimulus of admiring sympathy, but which never betrayed a weakness for mere feminine charm. He could on occasion say hard things about the fair sex, but they always seemed to like him for his bluntness. He disliked the *femme savante*; at least, he declared that only a fool would marry one. And yet, "the best apostles for the reunion of the churches," which had been his life-long dream, "would be a dozen women who desired it earnestly." Even here the paradox is not absent. Women, he said "have never done anything great," yet nothing "has ever been achieved without them." To close this topic with just one more inconsistency, which was really endured rather than wanted, de Maistre spent eleven years of his Russian "exile" separated from his "indispensable" wife and daughter.

Another early influence, which may as well be disposed of at once was that of his Jesuit teachers. His active life was to cover virtually the period of their dissolution and suppression. And it must have been a consolation to scattered members of this body, most hated by the dominant Voltairean element whom de Maistre despised, to see him wield his mighty pen in their behalf. "My grandfather loved the Jesuits," he writes, "my father loved them, my sublime mother loved them, I love them, my son loves them, and his son shall love them if the king permits him to have a son." He pleaded their cause at the court of St. Petersburg, and he rejoiced when Pius VII called them back to corporate life in 1814. Here, at least, there was never a hint of inconsistency. The Jesuits were poison to eighteenth century "philosophy." The Jacobin-Rationalist sons of the Revolution could see in de Maistre a kindred spirit. The Jesuits were loyal to the papacy, and notoriously Ultramontane in their teaching. So, too, was de Maistre. They were exiles and wanderers by virtue of the same Revolutionary turmoil which had ruined the homeland of their defender.

Any account of Joseph de Maistre is likely to be concerned chiefly, if not exclusively with his writings. But it is well to know that this vigorous thinker of strong and original ideas was every inch a man. A passing glance at his portrait reveals will power and keenness of intelligence. Into the making of his virile character went aristocratic family traditions, a well-regulated home life, and a thoroughly religious education. Writers have liked to discern also the influence of the rugged Alps which spread their sublimity and beauty around still medieval Chambéry. Nor must one forget the stirring events which crowded in upon his mature manhood. He was thirty-five when the French Revolution began. He saw invading armies sweep away the monarchy, the aristocracy and all the institutions of the Old Régime in Savoy. At the age of twenty he had become a magistrate. Then after eight years as fiscal attorney, he found himself a senator. He was well established for the future when Republican armies made him an exile, and incidentally a master in analyzing society and government on a wider stage.

A character sketch of Joseph de Maistre with even a slight touch of originality would be something of a literary feat. If one would praise him, he finds the vocabulary of laudation already exhausted. Negative criticism, on the other hand, must be made in the face of great weight of authority. Nor are the panegyrists found only in the Catholic, Clerical, Ultramontane group, the group which thinks as it thinks largely because de Maistre was its prophet. Even among those who dislike his doctrine there is much generous applause for the lone knight who stood fearless against the monster of Revolution. In him they see the one worthy "antithesis" of the Revolution, the "mirror of all that was brilliant and profound" in the forces opposed to the Revolution. Most of the sacred half-truths of the *Philosophes* he hated with a hatred that had in it an element of nobility. In him his enemies recognized the born champion of the tradition of the ancient Prophets and of the Christian past. They admired his prowess while they tried to destroy his influence. One might expect to find his friends unrestrained in their use of superlatives. But in the introductory chapter of a

presumably hostile critic, Paul Vulliaud (*Joseph de Maistre, franc-maçon*. Paris, 1926), we have ready to hand a reservoir of encomiums.

The half-French father of French Ultramontanism is called a "miracle of genius," a "giant"; he is ranked with the Doctors and Fathers of the Church; he is another Leibnitz, Bossuet, Fénelon, Pascal, even another Plato. The moral rectitude of his private life is equaled by his heroic fidelity as a public functionary. His literary verve, the beauty and power of his language win a sympathetic hearing even for his "errors." He is without a peer in his faculty for "inundating the past with light." Those who resent his attacks on the "sovereign independence of reason" are among the first to acknowledge his "honesty, courage, *esprit*, charm, courtesy, delicacy, amiability, his exquisite knowledge of the world and of human nature, his personal dignity, his vivid, incisive, penetrating irony, his ability to disentangle a sophism and to turn it back with blasting force on an enemy."

In the year 1774, at the age of twenty-one, de Maistre joined the Masonic lodge *des Trois Mortiers*. In 1778 he passed over to *Parfaite Sincérité*, a lodge of the Scottish Rite. Known among the brethren as *Josephus à Floribus*, he bore titles which to the uninitiated are all but meaningless, but which seem to indicate considerable activity in the Craft. Orator, Symbolic Master, Grand Professed, and finally Knight of the Beneficent Order of the Holy City, he rose in influence with his expanding enthusiasm until, after presenting his famous memorial to the Duke of Brunswick in 1788, he broke completely with Freemasonry and all its works in 1788 or 1789.

Writers have undertaken to "explain" the anomaly of the Catholic Mason. It has been said that de Maistre was associated only with a peculiarly "innocent" type of Masonry. He was, in fact, to refer to it later as childishness and tomfoolery. Certainly, there is no evidence of regret or qualms of conscience in his recollections of Masonic days. Freemasonry had been condemned by Clement XII as far back as 1738 and again in 1751 by Benedict XIV. But this did not prevent members of clergy and the Catholic aristocracy from aligning themselves with the Order. It seems that even sincere men could presume to "interpret" the papal condemnation. There are instances of high ecclesiastics, bishops for example, who merely shrugged their shoulders and refused to take the affair very seriously. The Masons were quite generally regarded as a gang of irresponsible, roistering, hard drinkers, about as colorless religiously as a present day Rotary Club. Reading our history backwards, we can now more clearly discern the naturalistic trend of the lodges, and the menace this held for the future. The pope showed a far-sighted appreciation of irreligious poison in the body politic, while Catholics of the eighteenth century saw only the surface actuality, and were satisfied, if not edified, by the brotherly benevolence of enthusiasts who clothed their revolutionary aims, conscious or unconscious, in a language of religion and piety.

One might write a defense of de Maistre's sincerity at the expense of his intelligence and perspicacity. He was enamored of the "illumination" of one, Saint-Martin, *le Philosophe Inconnu*, whom his brilliant sister, Thérèse,

(Turn to page fifty-seven)

Primo de Rivera: Benevolent Dictator

Marie R. Madden, Ph. D.

Fordham University

WHEN in 1923 Don Alfonso XIII recognized the fact that a ministry was impossible from the twenty-three parties returned to the Cortes in the elections of that year and called upon Primo de Rivera, Marqués de Estella, to assume responsibility the long delusion of government by the parliamentary system was at last ended. Since 1913 and the death of Canalejas, no Cabinet had had a majority, but since 1812 the attempt to govern Spain by this alien device had never been anything but a nightmare.

The famous Constitution of 1812, engineered by a clique, and put over by a trick of politics, was nevertheless accepted by the Spaniards because it preserved the old traditional political vocabulary and because none of the old codes was formally repudiated. It appeared workable to that doctrinaire generation, lovers of novelty, because it erected a "Liberal State," the final checkmate to the Catholic statesman, and because it embodied the parliamentary system in the framework of French so-called democracy, a combination of practical and speculative values which must surely have seemed the work of genius to the pamphleteers of that day.

For the Spaniards, however, the experience of less than a generation showed the shoddy nature of this façade, behind which personal animosities, factional rivalries and anti-Catholicism were but thinly concealed. Power was soon recognized to lie in control of the Cortes, and the Cortes in the control of the Cabinet. In the battle for this the Constitution was several times amended and fought over until an exhausted Spain was content to accept the gentleman's compromise of the Constitution of 1876. This confused and confusing document was the last hope of rooting Spain in the secular State while at the same time pretending to a liberty of conscience which would not be license. That the hope lingered on until 1923 was indeed a tribute to agile and skillful politicians balancing their Cabinets on factional differences, it would never have been possible had not the Spaniards been sorely distracted by the struggle to preserve in being the organization of their Church and by the proletarian movements seeping into Spain in the wake of the economic ruin wrought by the long series of confiscations of property and the disruption of the old social order and such industrialization as Spain admitted.

The American War of 1898 proved that tightrope walkers in charge of the government had lost Spain both prestige and respect. The sudden coming into the European limelight of the Moroccan question was a portent, not to be missed by the keen Spaniards, that the very existence of their country, the ancient Españas, was threatened. These were the events that awoke the Catholic conscience to the voice of the Church, and these the events that gave to the de-Catholicized Spaniards a sense of triumph. These Spaniards turned then to eliminate their "Liberal" leaders. If in the nineteenth century the Cortes had been an arena for leisure debate, in the twentieth it became the theatre for the fall of the Liberals.

The battle was now joined, and as so often in Spanish

history it became the responsibility of the Monarchy to straighten out the tangled affairs of the country. And so in 1923, the King surrounded as he was and as he had been since birth by Masonic influences, handed over this task to Primo de Rivera. This action of their King was the one chance the Spaniards had to save their country without bloodshed. But as is so often the case in such crises those who perceived this chance most clearly were found in greater numbers among the enemies than among the friends and lovers of Spain. This was the tragic fact that Primo de Rivera had to face as he took over the task of liquidating the wreck the nineteenth century had made of his country.

Was he the man for this strong yet delicate task? The men of 1929 said: no. The men of heroic action of today would say: yes, for it was he who once and for all destroyed the Liberal State which had been consistently an obstacle to reform. The Marqués de Estella does not present an heroic figure. But who in Spain could have accomplished what this Andalusian did with his curious mixture of integrity and conceit? Those who knew him note his courage, his energy and pride, his essential kindness and generosity, his worldly pragmatism, his intemperate language and fits of easy-going good nature, his simplicity and the vigorous comprehension of his mind, which grasped the essential difficulties of Spain.

He was Catholic, but he was also a product of Liberal Spain, and it is not surprising therefore that although he saw the evils clearly, he did not appreciate their source sufficiently and hence in the end he was undone. This explains the fact of his prime error that although not a Mason he was tolerant of Masonic influence and although not a Socialist he thought to win their cooperation on policies the antithesis of their own.

Born in 1870 of a family of soldiers, Don Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja went at his task with the resolution that befitted the man who had won the cross of St. Ferdinand in the Mellila campaign of 1893. He acted with military decision, but he did not set up military dictatorship in the popular use of the word. In a speech to the press three days after he had accepted the government (September 15, 1923) he said, "The heart of the evil of Spain lies very deep. It resides in rural *caciquismo* and we must direct our forces to extirpating this before we can call new elections. We shall try to destroy all the scaffolding erected by the political organization." Again he said, "I am not a dictator; no one can justly apply to me this appellation. I am a man whom his comrades in arms, perhaps mistakenly, have honored with this difficult mission of reframing the constitution of the fatherland."

The cornerstones of his policy were religion, patriotism, the monarchy. In the denial of these he saw the subversion of all that had made Spain and without which Spaniards would cease to be. And so he proposed to bring them into their proper places in Spanish society. To him the Catholic religion was an integral part of Spanish life. To see in the religion of the Spaniards a mere tradition, a lyrical invocation of the past, "a salute which in passing

Spain makes by routine to the Cross which symbolizes her tradition," was to deny to it the real and true value it has, because religion is a natural reality and as such imposes itself upon the individual, upon society and upon the State.¹ The Spanish religious tradition has the force of a Spanish conviction, and this Primo de Rivera was prepared to uphold, to go further and to insist that conviction carries with it the obligation of giving a Catholic sense to all orientation of individual and social policies was perhaps too much to expect of a man of Primo de Rivera's generation.

To him the monarchy also was an integral part of Spanish life. He considered it a necessary institution, at once the core and symbol of the collective political life of the people and as such it should be maintained, supported and respected. The immense devotion and prestige which the Spaniards give to their monarchy (despite the personal unworthiness of so many monarchs) derive from the particular functions which it was erected for, and expected to perform in the Spanish State.² In the Spanish political tradition, government of the State was considered a directing agency, a *regiment*, and the one invested with its authority was expected to stand aloof partaking of none of the particular interests which he had to direct but serving all. This was the general function of the monarchy and not all the experience of the eighteenth century, nor the scandalous reign of Ferdinand VII, followed by the regency of María Cristina, his widow, and the reign of Isabella II, his daughter, disillusioned them to the extent of abandoning the monarchy for a republic in the modern sense. Nevertheless, the influence of French thought did succeed in well-nigh destroying the tradition of its peculiar service, and the English political influence had reduced its actual functions to the Spanish equivalent of the English public opinion.³

Public opinion governs in no country, of course. Primo de Rivera realized that to assign such a function to the Spanish monarchy and expect it to work was fantastic. He proposed to restore reality to the monarchy, but before it could be re-instated the accumulated political rubbish of the nineteenth century had to be swept out. For this he needed the cooperation of all Spain, and so he aimed to awaken Spanish patriotism. No reform could succeed without the nation, and no national action was possible without patriotism. Hence his program must assume the proper functioning of the Catholic religion, the monarchy and national cooperation.

His analysis of the ills of Spain arranged the problems in the order of the most pressing needs and in the order in which he proposed to solve them. First there was Morocco, next came the reform of the municipios, economic life, education, the army. Then the country would be ready for a new constitution. But to implement the paper reforms on what could he rely? There was no public opinion; there were only the wild speech of the anarchist and the socialist and the repetitions of the university professors. There was no party. There were only groups, factions and a proletariat. There was abso-

lutely no alternative to a Liberal débâcle except a socialist débâcle, unless the Catholic State could be revised. But where were the Catholics? Catholic thought and leaders had begun to be creative but numbers were lacking.⁴

To appreciate the difficult obstacles with which Primo de Rivera had to contend, we must comprehend the forces that had planned and worked for the destruction of the old Catholic Spanish State. The particular agencies were the Freemasons, the socialists and the anarchists. The first attempts to de-Christianize the Spanish State began with Wall and Tanucci in the eighteenth century and by the time of the French Revolution Masonic lodges were regularly established. Later the anarchists and socialists joined forces and were used by the Masons.

We may summarize briefly the line of developments. By 1850 all shades of socialist opinion from Fourier to Louis Blanc and Karl Marx had been introduced into Spain and received wide currency because of the general poverty induced by the wars and the many confiscations of property which only made the rich richer and the poor poorer. The exploitations of the new industrialism flourishing in the reign of Isabella II introduced the proletariat. In 1864 the International Association of Workers was formed, but soon divided into two groups, Marxists and followers of Bakunin, the later anarchists who declared themselves enemies of the State, of religion, of capitalism. The anarchist centers were in Madrid and Barcelona, though Andalucía and the industrial cities and mining centers were fertile fields for recruits. This middle period was the time when the Liberal ministries—Silvela, Canovas del Castillo, Sagasta, Maura, Romanones—representing the industrialists, financiers and the plutocracy generally, were in power and persecuted both groups. Consequently both worked underground for a time to percolate the proletariat and the intellectuals among whom considerable success was obtained especially among the university professors and news writers.

In 1889 Pablo Iglesias organized the Union General de Trabajadores and put up candidates for the municipal councils, but did not win any seats until in 1897 three were secured in Bilbao. The leaders were Canalejas Lerroux, Blasco Ibañez, Melquíades Alvarez. In 1899 the U. G. T. moved their headquarters to Madrid. Iglesias bitterly fought the French policy of Waldeck-Rousseau, Juarez and Millerand which was to secure entry into politics by cooperating with the bourgeois capitalism. He persisted in running socialist tickets until, in 1905, Iglesias, R. García Ormaechea and F. Largo Caballero were elected to the Madrid Council. The People's House was opened in Madrid in 1908 and by then the socialists had 71 councilmen in 30 ayuntamientos, and the U. G. T. claimed 39,668 federations. These engineered the general strike of 1909 in Barcelona. After the execution of Ferrer, Iglesias agreed to a block with the anarchists and in November, 1909, the Republican Socialist Union was formed by whose aid Iglesias got into the Cortes in 1910. By now the socialists could claim such intellectual leaders as Luis Araquistain, Besteiro and Fernando de los Rios.

Anarchism was much more confined to secret channels, but its doctrines were well received in Cataluña, Valencia,

¹ José María Perinan, *El Hecho y la Idea de la Unión Patriótica*. Madrid, 1929.

² Cf. M. R. Madden, *Political Theory and Law in Medieval Spain*. Fordham University Press, 1930. Chapter V.

³ G. Maura Gamazo, *Bosquejo Histórico de la Dictadura*. Madrid, 1930, II, 339-40.

⁴ *The Catholic Church in Contemporary Europe*, New York, 1932, pp. 293-50.

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

RAYMOND CORRIGAN, Editor

Staff

FRANCIS J. ASPENLEITER	CHARLES L. SANDERSON
RICHARD T. JONES	EMMET A. KILKER
ARTHUR J. MURPHY	RAYMOND J. DERRIG
LOWRIE J. DALY	FRANCIS E. HOGAN
WILLIAM J. BURTON	EUGENE O. LATTA
RICHARD L. PORTER	ALBERT C. ZABOLIO
WALTER F. HARRIS	



Advisory Board

MARTIN J. HARNEY	FRANCIS S. BETTEN
Boston College	Marquette University
THOMAS F. MAHER	W. PATRICK DONNELLY
Gonzaga University	Spring Hill College
CHARLES H. METZGER	PETER M. DUNNE
West Baden College	University of San Francisco
LAURENCE K. PATTERSON	
Woodstock College	

MARTIN F. HASTING, Business Manager

Address communications to The Historical Bulletin, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

EDITORIALS

Why the Muddy Sources?

The Spanish War will soon belong to history. When it broke, nearly three years ago, we saw in the carnage and tragedy two reasons for optimism: the spiritual quickening of Spain and the discrediting of sinister forces at work in Europe. Spain is being reborn. And the Red hand of the Moscow (more recently of the Barcelona) Commintern has been uncovered. But Communism alone explains little. The "Liberal" Revolution of 1931 has been ascribed (rightly, we think,) to Communism, Masonry and international finance. Does this suggest a solution to the enigma of "Loyalist" support in high places? Does it, further, account for a press, daily and periodical, which is still pitifully myopic? Does it explain much of the wild talk about the "Democracies" of the world,—from which Masonry has not been expelled?

We should like to read the histories of fifty years hence. Critical research will, of course, have to filter the truth through a deal of rubbish. And the traditional canons of criticism will be put to a severe test. In our studies of the past we have fondly clung to the dictum: NEMO GRATIS MENDAX. In the story of the Spanish War the future historian will come upon a heap of unblushing, deliberate falsehood. His Excellency, the propagandist ambassador of Red Spain has been called "a common ordinary liar!" And, apparently, he would prefer not to discuss the matter. The gangster "government" which he represents has discarded "bourgeois ethics," anyway.

In the hour of Nationalist victory, when the moral infection focused in Barcelona is being eradicated, it would seem unkind to hint that newspaper files are bulging with a thousand examples of dishonest journalism. And the sad feature of the mess is that the press will neither repent nor retreat. When did columnist, editor or reporter ever make an act of contrition? Rarely, if ever, have "sources" been so muddled.

The Christmas Convention

At the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, during the past Christmas Week, the American Historical Association met concurrently with the American Catholic Historical Association and thirteen other learned societies. Not the

least among the factors making for comfort, and consequently for the success of the meeting were the wide spaces of the "world's biggest hotel." The Catholics in particular had reason to be grateful to the hotel management for the headquarters assigned to them. The smooth functioning of the Catholic program was, as usual, the result of much forethought and action on the part of Monsignor Guilday and his efficient local committee. On the whole, the 1938 meeting was a source of encouragement to those of us who like to see History go forward.

Every convention has its high moments,—often unexpected. We have had occasion to call attention to brilliant presidential addresses in the past. With practically three full years in which to cast about for a topic, gather his thoughts, new and old, and then organize the whole into a piece of scholarly entertainment for an assured audience, the retiring president of the A. H. A. always should, and sometimes does, deliver something worth while. This year, Frederic L. Paxson satisfied most of us with his timely and appropriate discussion of "The Great Demobilization." It was the type of address that arouses neither indignation nor intense enthusiasm. Quite unlike this glorified class-room lecture was the stirring, provocative, almost revolutionary address of Ross Hoffman, retiring president of the A. C. H. A. Professor Hoffman said forcefully the things which only a philosophical mind will conceive and only a brave man will say.

He exposed the fallacies of *Historismus*, which he described as "that rigorously objective and 'scientific' historiography" produced by the unworthy disciples of the great Ranke at the close of the past century, and which he defined quite simply as "rationalist positivism." Ranke himself had been neither positivist nor rationalist. He had "flung himself down, pious Lutheran that he was, before the unfathomable mystery of things." His method was adequate for the purposes to which he applied it. But when historians presumed to probe below the surface of political events they ran against a reality that had no place in their pseudo-philosophy. Their mechanistic concepts were hopelessly inept when they came to deal with the soul of man. Starting with an altogether false notion of the nature of man (and of his essential relationship to his Creator), they could not explain the human be-

havior of past ages which thought and felt and lived (however imperfectly) under the influence of a less distorted psychology.

To some it will seem mere arrogance to assert that the Catholic, the historian of an integrally Catholic mind, is best equipped to "enter subjectively and completely into this great spiritual drama," which Belloc, Berdyaev, Peter Wust and a dozen other seekers after historical sanity unfold before us. But we agree with Professor Hoffman wholeheartedly, and we admire his courage. The better minds among those still outside the Church will not be offended. In their reaction against a bankrupt positivism they may even welcome a leader with strong convictions. We refer our readers to the printed address of Professor Hoffman in the current *Catholic Historical Review*.

The most complete single session of the convention, at least from the standpoint of an editorial writer, was the complimentary luncheon at which the president of Chicago University and a Northwestern dean ventured a few "comments." Both speakers criticized the program as a mixtum of this and that without any indication of a meaning behind it all. This, of course, touches the most vital problem of the historical profession. It recalls the theme of Ross Hoffman and his appeal for a working philosophy of history. It is in harmony with a movement which has been gathering force during the past two or three years. Any non-historical guest at the luncheon would have derived more from the brief utterances of two privileged non-historical speakers than he could have gotten from more academic sections of the program. He would have observed a double tendency, one keyed to a high idealism, the other content to sprawl about on a low level.

Robert M. Hutchins said in a very striking way what we have wanted to hear him say. Every scholar must be an historian. Every historian must be a philosopher. Every historian must be a moralist. These three propositions he "established," so he said, "by merely stating" them. He gently poked fun at the scholars who "make a darkness, and call it research." Professional groups have to submit, now and then, to being lectured by amateurs. But in this instance, the amateur had something to offer the value of which depends largely upon the cumulative effect of similar counsels from within the history guild. Certainly, the student of past events and movements should try to penetrate to the reality behind the surface records. He should approach his task with a dependable philosophy of life, and his sane view of the march of human affairs should deepen his grasp of the meaning of life. Surely, the historian should be a philosopher. As a moralist, too, he should be alert to the moral good and evil in the persons and things he studies. There are signs that we are nearing a turn for the better.

Dr. Hutchins left his audience on a high level of academic thought. He pointed to ideals worth aspiring to. His colleague, or shall we say, rival, on the program expressed no such elevated views. In fact, he seemed bent upon dragging history and historians through the mud, metaphorically speaking. We can understand his conscious reluctance to face the inevitable contrast between himself and the president of a neighboring institution.

But this does not quite excuse his un-academic freedom, nor the bad taste which made an historical figure of Sally Rand. Still, as an indication of almost inevitable tendencies among historians, the low-brow effort of Dean Snyder is enlightening. The call has gone forth to historians to shake themselves free from fact-grubbing, and to seek a meaning in the life of the past. When better minds respond we can be sure that others will, by a process of polarization, rush to the opposite extreme. Our search for a philosophy of history is aided by a growing reaction against a decomposing materialism. We can expect a similar and opposite reaction against the attempt to raise and ennoble the historian's task. On the whole, however, the net result of stirring activity among us has been a more wholesome attitude toward historical studies.

It may be undignified to call the convention a ten-ring circus. Actually, there were at times more than ten groups in session. Hence it was easy to find something of interest to those who attend formal discussions. But it was impossible to take in the whole meeting. Moreover the Chicago daily press gave less attention to the historians than has the press of any city in which we have met in recent years. Some notice was given to Father Raphael N. Hamilton's plea for a revision of the Turner Hypothesis in favor of the early missionaries; Dr. Hans Kohn pronounced Hitler the world's greatest actor in 1938, and the reporters sensed some slight news value in the statement; Father Harry C. Koenig got some attention for his research on Saint Robert Bellarmine and his family. These items aside, there was nothing to inform a voracious reading public that Chicago was entertaining the elite of the historical profession.

Among the few sessions which the writer was able to attend one stands out. Dr. Herbert C. F. Bell provided much lively discussion of his paper, "Politics and Religion in Modern England." The major fallacy, which crumbled badly during the discussion, was the prevailing tendency of recent authors to departmentalize religion. First, of course, it was necessary to establish the fact that religion was a factor in the political life of England. But the larger issue of the intimate relation between religion and life was also given a good airing, though it would, perhaps, have perturbed the harmony of the meeting to insist upon the essential distinction between religion and any mere department of human activity. A man may or may not be interested in business, the theatre or cricket. But no man can arbitrarily elect to remain outside the sphere of religion. Either he does or does not acknowledge his dependence upon his Creator. He cannot escape an essential dependence. The repudiation of religion by an individual or by a nation is an historical fact which should merit attention by reason of its huge abnormality, at least. No historical phenomenon is of more importance than modern Secularism. The topic calls loudly for fuller development. A lengthy paper by the writer before the A. C. H. A. suggests restraint at this point.

Perhaps it was merely zeal for the spread of historical truth that prompted the program committee to give the International Film Bureau an opening for Soviet propaganda. Red Russia in the person of Max Eastman displayed a patch-work of Burton Holmes-Julian Bryan pic-

(Turn to page sixty-two)

Richelieu: Politics versus Religion

Sister M. Purissima Reilly, O. P., M. A.

St. Mark's High School, St. Louis

RICHELIEU has been a loadstone for scholars and litterateurs during the three centuries since his death. The very illusiveness of his character and genius are a challenge to the investigator. Historians attempt to simplify their chameleonic subject and to fix him to a definiteness of delineation, but usually they succeed only in deepening our impression of his inscrutability, or in over-simplifying his character by elision. In any case, we are likely to carry away the conviction that this Cardinal-statesman was completely statesman in ideals, motivation, and activity, and cardinal only in the externals of that dignity. It is significant, however, that the great spiritual revival of the seventeenth century was at its height during Richelieu's ascendancy in France.

An absolute estimate of Richelieu, then, is admittedly difficult, though we retain a lurking feeling that he was an out-and-out secularist. The impression is confirmed in Mr. Belloc's thesis:

Richelieu more than any other man and more than any impersonal force both founded Nationalism and made permanent the division between Catholic and Protestant culture.¹

But certainty wavers when Abbé Bremond succinctly remarks:

He feared hell and loved theology, he was not indifferent towards the things of God, but his kingdom was of this world.² The definitiveness is dissipated on following the long list of ecclesiastical achievements, listed by the eminent Goyau, which bear witness to Richelieu's active participation in church affairs.³ It is well to recall at this time that Hilaire Belloc qualifies his blasting indictment by pointing to the fact that Richelieu could not foresee the future nor could he in seventeenth century France, steeped as it was in the Catholic tradition of a thousand years, believe that the great monarchy which he served could be anything but a champion of the Catholic cause among the powers of the future. It would seem that the evil of which the Cardinal stands indicted can be extenuated by circumstances and intention.

His Early Life

Rarely is the truism "the child is father to the man" better exemplified than in the life of Richelieu. He was born in 1585, during the religious wars that harassed the France of that period, and his early childhood was spent in a territory ravaged by the havoc of civil strife. He was destined for a military career through the wisdom of his capable mother, who planned the future of her children with due regard for their vocational tendencies. But the natural bent of Armand Jean was deflected from its original purpose when his brother, Alphonse, decided to enter the Grande Chartreuse in 1602. The financial needs of the family demanded a successor to the bishopric of Luçon, the benefice given to the father, Francois du Plessis, by Henry III. The poor health of the future cardinal conspired with this crisis to make him the ecclesi-

astic of the family. In a letter to his uncle, supposed to have been written at this time, Richelieu says: "The will of God must be done; I shall accept all for the good of the Church and the glory of our name."⁴

The redirection of the life of this erstwhile cadet to the service of the priesthood was, then, a matter of expediency with an admixture of faith in Divine Providence. That he always remained a man of military tastes is plainly evident, and the traits that later defined the Cardinal-minister had their source in this period. The rapid decisions, the utilization of opportunity, the calm sure judgment of men, the surprise tactics, and the fascination which the martial atmosphere always held for him, were all part of it. His extraordinary military acumen was an inborn aptitude nurtured by training, and it projects itself into all that he accomplished, political and ecclesiastical.

Having entered on his new course, he determined to excel, and he succeeded through an extraordinary application. When the time came, Henry IV urged the French envoy at Rome to sue for his appointment as bishop at the conclusion of his studies. When the delay became ominous, the young cleric grew restive and, on the advice of the king, betook himself to Rome. Here he attracted the attention of high ecclesiastics and particularly the Pontiff, Paul V, who was greatly impressed by the sagacity and modesty of the youthful French priest.⁵ He was duly consecrated on April 15, 1607, by Cardinal de Givry, although he had not attained to the canonical age. Whether he falsified his date of birth to secure the episcopacy remains a moot question with able adherents on both sides.

On his return to Paris the new bishop became a member of the faculty of the Sorbonne and began to insinuate himself into the court circle by his eloquent preaching and engaging manners. He lost no opportunity to ingratiate himself with the people who counted. That he succeeded well is attested by Henry IV's pride in his talented protégé whom he called "my bishop", and by Marie de Medici's recognition of his courtly graciousness to her. But in the first glow of his splendid début, the young prelate suddenly betook himself from this, his natural environment, to work in the seclusion of the diocese of Luçon, which he called, "the ugliest bishopric in France." Only his penetration of ultimate values can explain his flight; the effectiveness of the stratagem on his future success proves the wisdom of this sabbatical.

To make less drab his provincial milieu, with all its dreary reminders of the desolation of civil war, he set himself to acquire some of the trappings of nobility. He always remained, it may be noted, ridiculously vain about

⁴ Gabriel Hanotaux, *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu*, Paris, 1893, I, 76. This is the best contribution to the study of Richelieu.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 82. Hanotaux gives an interesting picture of Richelieu at this time: "He studied the languages spoken in Rome, Italian and Spanish, showing almost a contempt of French. He looked for logical discussions. He shone by the extent of his knowledge and modesty of his bearing. Pope Paul V . . . went so far as to confide to him the inquietude which the conduct of Henry IV inspired in the Holy See."

¹ Hilaire Belloc, *Richelieu*, Philadelphia, 1929, p. 20.

² Henri Bremond, *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, New York, 1930, II, 125.

³ Georges Goyau, "Richelieu," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIII, 48.

his rank. Then he turned to the renovation of his diocese, undertaking an extensive building program and a sweeping reform of the secular clergy under his jurisdiction. To arouse the faithful he brought to Luçon energetic and talented preachers, among whom was the eminent founder of the Oratory, Cardinal de Bérulle. Incidentally, this churchman was an effective medium for entrée at Court, and his influence was well utilized by the calculating Richelieu. Ecclesiastical appraisal of the young bishop's reforms and conversions among the Huguenots was generous and immediate. French churchmen began to see the promise in the young bishop of Luçon, and the powerful Cardinal du Perron enshrined him as a model for other bishops to follow.⁶

It was at this time that he made his first contact with Père Joseph, the Capuchin mystic. This acquaintance was destined to mature into a life-long friendship and to give to the "terrible" Cardinal the only deeply human devotion he was to inspire in his fellow-man. How far the mysticism of the Capuchin penetrated the urbanity of the French statesman is a matter for conjecture. Bremond is skeptical of Richelieu's spiritual improvement and intimates that association had a deleterious effect on the holy man.⁷

During the six years in Luçon, Richelieu was widening his sphere of influence in other directions. He cultivated the friendship of leading Gallicans and future Jansenists, and injected an understanding note into his relations with the most aggressive Huguenots. Toleration and conciliation are the keynotes of this period. His indifference to religious radicalism in Catholic France is the root of his secularism, the by-product of his first principle of political unity. It testifies to his surprising lack of vision, a lack, which according to Belloc, caused "the reduction of Catholic culture to the defensive under the supremacy of anti-Catholic and mainly Protestant forces."⁸ But the vision needed was a spiritual endowment, and could flourish only in a rarefied atmosphere, unclouded by worldly ambition.

The years of seclusion in Luçon were full years for the future statesman. His new friendships were to be profitable for a penetration of the court's inner sanctum, and his reputation among the clergy for singular zeal and administrative ability a definite asset. He was now marked for high places. During the disorders of 1612, he conciliated the Huguenots of his province, by maintaining order there. He did not fail to notify the secretary of State of his success. When the States-General of 1614 was summoned, Richelieu was sent by the clergy of Poitou to represent them in Paris. This brought him to the entrance of the charmed circle, and it is not surprising to see him take his stand with the majority party. He used the occasion to deliver an eloquent address stating the principles of the ultramontanists which, at that time, had the support of the regent. He attacked lay investiture, clerical taxation, interference with clerical jurisdiction, and the non-conformity with the decrees of the Council of Trent, concluding with an extravagant tribute to Marie de Medici. The effect was stimulating. He had already been singled out for preferment. He was now

sent on diplomatic missions, acquitting himself well in each of them. In 1616, at the age of thirty-one, he became secretary of state. He had arrived by a tortuous route.

But his achievement was short-lived. His obsequiousness to the regent and the detested Concini involved him in their ruin. The Italian favorite was assassinated, Louis XIII took over the reigns of government, and the queen-mother went into exile at Bloise, taking with her the faithful bishop of Luçon. Within a few months the vindictiveness of Richelieu's enemies forced him into the retirement of the Priory of Coussay. Here he hoped to dissipate any suspicion of flamboyancy in his loyalty to Marie de Medici by his complete absorption in controversial studies. His continued active correspondence with her, however, increased the intrigue that had swept him into its vortex a short time before, and he was sent, in 1618, out of French territory into the region of Avignon. After one year, the benighted diplomat returned to Luçon, where he devoted himself to theological treatises. Among these was his catechism, *Instruction du chrétien*, a work which draws from Goyau, the tribute: "a real blessing at a time when ignorance of religion was the principal evil."⁹ Le Clerc blightingly remarks that it "was more political than theological in content."¹⁰

Under the Red Robe Lies France

With the death of the favorite, Luynes, the queen-mother returned to the court, and used the first moments of her reconciliation in importuning her royal son to obtain the Cardinal's hat for Richelieu. Gregory XV, after some hesitation, granted the coveted distinction. Soon the inefficiency of the royal secretaries and the recollection of past diplomatic achievements opened the way for the admission of the new cardinal to the council. On April 29, 1624, within a few months he had attained an ascendancy over the king, and had taken over the destinies of the kingdom of France.

As the events of Richelieu's life unfold, we are conscious that each achievement was the result of a carefully laid plan; delay serving only as a respite to reinforce his position. He was dominated by ambition—it was the flame that consumed his entire life. His position as the most astute statesman of all time was no accident but the result of well-studied principles which are set down in his *Testament politique*. In it he affirms the necessity of repression for the maintenance of public order, declaring that "Impunity opens the door to license." "Theoretically he is for rigor," claims the able Battifol, "but in practice he was accessible to considerations of the feebleness of human nature and even, at times, benevolent."¹¹

Richelieu's relations with the royal family are eloquent of the man's character. For the monarchy and the king the minister possessed a fervid devotion, a devotion which colors all that he did, giving to his ceaseless energy purpose and direction. Marius Topin in an excellent study and collection of unedited letters substantiates this appraisal and dissipates the usual impression of the King's distrust.¹² In Gaston, the dissolute brother of the king,

⁹ Goyau, *loc. cit.*, 48.

¹⁰ M. Le Clerc, *La Vie du Cardinal, duc de Richelieu*, Amsterdam, 1753, I, 33.

¹¹ Louis Battifol, *Richelieu et le roi Louis XIII*, Paris, 1934, 30.

¹² Marius Topin, *Louis XIII et Richelieu*, Paris, 1877.

⁶ Richard Lodge, *Richelieu*, London, 1930, 16.

⁷ Bremond, *op. cit.*, 142.

⁸ Belloc, *op. cit.*, 72.

the Cardinal had a major problem, for that young profligate stood ready to be party to any plot within or without the state. His marriage to the sister of Charles IV of Lorraine is a case in point. The strategic position of this kingdom was of immense importance to the plans of Richelieu, and the consequent dissolution of the marriage bond in a Gallican synod, against the protests of Urban VIII, remained to discredit his ecclesiastical status in Rome.

The women of the family were of even greater annoyance to Richelieu since it was impossible to use drastic measures against them, and their culpability was veiled by the sympathy that they excited. Both ladies were, apparently, the victims of the ruthlessness of this parvenu, and both intrigued untiringly to bring about his ruin. Richelieu's protection lay in his omniscience and implacability, and the lack of trust which Louis XIII had in his unnatural mother and unprepossessing wife. The cleavage between Anne of Austria and her royal husband was cleverly widened over the Buckingham affair; be-

tween Marie de Medici and her son in the dramatic episode of the Day of Dupes, November 11, 1630, when the Cardinal unexpectedly appeared at Luxembourg to blast her attempt to have him dismissed from the king's service.

The intrigue that harassed him on every side was summarily dealt with. In the purge of the nobility that followed his ascent to power he was "as inexorable as fate itself." First one and then another of the best blood of France went down before his implacable tenacity of purpose: Chalais, Montmorency, Marillac, and de Thou—each in the eyes of the inscrutable minister a fomentor of disloyalty, an enemy of the state. Such was the program which brought results in the complete subordination of the factious nobles. The Huguenots were similarly vanquished and in the siege of La Rochelle in 1627-28, the Cardinal-minister exhibited a characteristic intrepidity. In the end, the Huguenot power was broken and France was practically free from internal dissension.

(To be continued)

Wilfrid and Theodore: A Struggle for Primacy

Henry W. Casper, S. J., M. A.

St. Mary's College

HISTORIANS of the Anglican Church without exception have taken the greatest interest in the question of the existence of a national church in England long before the Act of Supremacy under Henry VIII definitely broke relations between the *Ecclesia Anglicana* and the papacy. The significance of the Wilfrid-Theodore controversy lies in the fact that the case is one most frequently cited by Anglican historians to validate their contention that the English Reformation marked no break in the continuity of the English Church. The story of Wilfrid's contest with Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, and his subsequent appeals to Rome constitutes the most prominent conflict between churchmen in the whole ecclesiastical history of Anglo-Saxon England. Trouble arose when Wilfrid objected to the arbitrary manner in which Theodore undertook to remove him from his diocese of York and to replace him with three new bishops. The fact that Wilfrid appealed over the Primatial See to Rome for a judgment which would reinstate him in his possessions, and, in spite of a favorable decision from the Apostolic See, obtained no redress, is constantly cited to illustrate the autonomy of the English Church in these early Anglo-Saxon times. The problem is, then: does the Wilfrid-Theodore controversy illustrate an autonomous ecclesiastical organization and government in England in Anglo-Saxon times?

The relations between these two men, the one the Bishop of York, the other the Archbishop of Canterbury, offer a singular problem. Whether Theodore was actually appointed papal legate with supreme ecclesiastical authority over England by Pope Vitalian is a question. The fact is, however, that, whatever was his appointment, Theodore conducted himself as possessed of such supreme powers. Almost immediately after his arrival in England in May, 669, he set about reorganizing the entire government of the Church, and it was probably the procedure

of this reorganization which precipitated the deposition of Wilfrid from his See of York. If William of Malmesbury's account is reliable, the plan of ecclesiastical reorganization, or at least that part of reorganization which affected the possessions of Wilfrid, was inspired by the envy of Ermenburga, Queen of Northumbria, of Wilfrid's wealth.¹ In addition to having been the Bishop of York, Wilfrid was also Abbot of Ripon, Hexam and Holy Island. His singular amiability, according to William of Malmesbury, had ingratiated him with kings, nobles, bishops, abbots and abbesses. Frequently he was made their heir, and often enough during their lifetime the executor of their estates.² Ermenburga prevailed on King Egfrid to despoil Wilfrid of his extensive possessions, and presumably the methods which Egfrid employed entailed the redivision of episcopal sees. In order to comply with the invidious ambitions of the royal household of Northumbria Theodore, without in any way consulting Wilfrid, introduced three new bishops into what had formerly been the jurisdiction of the Bishop of York.

Since there does not seem to be any other authority to corroborate Malmesbury's account, we cannot conclude with certainty to the fact that royal greed lay at the bottom of Wilfrid's deposition. Bede is silent about the matter, as is also the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Eddius, the biographer of Wilfrid, and very probably his chaplain, who has left us the most authoritative account of Wilfrid's life, only hints at such an explanation as Malmesbury has given us. And while neither Bede, nor the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* treat the contest between Theodore and Wilfrid in the detailed manner in which do both Eddius and Malmesbury, nevertheless it would seem that the factor of royal avarice was too important a detail to omit in even the most general summary of the case. On the

¹ *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, PL, CLXXIX, 1557, 1558.

² *Ibid.*

other hand the later repentance of Theodore, about which more detail will follow, lends plausibility to Malmesbury's interpretation. Since both his *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* and the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* constitute authoritative sources for so much of early English history, it is only proper to present Malmesbury's version of a controversy which is so frequently cited to prop the arguments for a medieval national church in England.

Wilfrid first appealed his case to the court of Egfrid. But when his appeal to the royal court met with no success, the deposed Bishop threatened to appeal to Rome. This threat met only with derision, which according to T. Dunbar Ingram was motivated by the uniqueness of the Bishop's threatened proposal.³ However, the alleged uniqueness does not fit in well with the history of times when numerous incidents in early English history unmistakably reveal England's attitude toward Rome's superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Moreover, there is no evidence whatever in William of Malmesbury that the derision which was accorded Wilfrid's threat was anything else but the malicious reaction of a party which was intent on confiscating the wealth of the Bishop of York. If Malmesbury may be believed, then the case of Wilfrid is merely an illustration of a rapacious and unscrupulous monarch who had employed the Primate of England to accomplish his designs.

If the factor of greed and the envy of the king and queen are not conclusive bits of evidence that the case of Wilfrid does not argue against a theory of prevalent opposition to Roman ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England at that time, then it is important to observe that not only did Wilfrid appeal to Rome, but that Theodore also sent the monk Kenewald to Pope Agatho to explain his actions against Wilfrid.⁴ The principle or the right of appealing to Rome was no part of the struggle. That issue could not have been present in the minds of Wilfrid's adversaries, else Theodore would never have permitted himself to be represented at a "foreign court" in a case which was entirely beyond the jurisdiction of that court. The opposition which was offered to Wilfrid, both with regard to the property which was taken from him and the appeals which he made to Rome, was a matter of expediency, a matter of attaining in the shortest possible time and in the briefest way what was determined to be gotten by hook or by crook. Were the principle of appealing to Rome at stake, then Theodore surely should have been similarly punished for daring to depute the monk Kenewald to explain his actions to a "foreign court." Theodore implicitly acknowledged Wilfrid's right to appeal to Rome when he dispatched Kenewald to Pope Agatho, and in acknowledging that right of appeal he acknowledged Rome's ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Anglo-Saxon Church. Had Theodore and King Egfrid deemed Wilfrid's action to be an affront to the sovereignty of Northumbria and the autonomy of the British Church, it would scarcely have become Theodore to commission an agent to explain his own actions to a court that had no jurisdiction whatever over him, and Egfrid to permit Theodore to take such an "unpatriotic step."

In his address to Pope Agatho Wilfrid showed that he regarded Theodore's division of the See of York as con-

trary to Canon Law and his right to appeal to Rome as guaranteed by the same Law.⁵ And his appeal was similarly regarded by the Pope. The synod to which the Pope entrusted Wilfrid's hearing decreed that he was to be reinstated in all of his former possessions.

In spite of the command of the Apostolic See the Northumbrian Witan refused to restore Wilfrid to the See of York. One cannot read the account written by Eddius without being convinced that the refusal of the Witan was based on anything else than a criminal determination to conserve ill-gotten goods.

There is included in Eddius' biography of Wilfrid a letter written by Theodore in which the Archbishop of Canterbury acknowledged that he had acted unjustly in Wilfrid's regard.⁷ If earlier Theodore had by his high-handed actions appeared as the primate of an autonomous church, his subsequent retractions and his attempts to restore Wilfrid to his old status made it apparent that in later life he was of a changed mind. In the same year, 686, the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote a letter to Ethelfrid, King of Mercia, and pleaded in Wilfrid's behalf.⁸ Largely through the intervention of Theodore Wilfrid was reconciled with Ealdfrith, who succeeded to the throne of Egfrid in Northumbria, and was restored, first, to the See of Hexham, which was made vacant by the death of Eata and which he held only for one year. Then Wilfrid was restored to the Bishopric of York and to the monastery of Ripon. Also, between the death of Cuthbert and the consecration of his successor, Eadbert, he held the See of Lindisfarne.

The harmony which had been established between Wilfrid and Ealdfrith did not long endure. For over a period of years differences threatened to terminate the truce. The fact that the king secularized certain property at St. Peter's, York, induced Wilfrid to remonstrate with the king. In the second place, Ealdfrith attempted to establish a bishopric at Ripon, and, in the third place, he demanded that Wilfrid obey the decrees of Theodore. As a result of these turns in the progress of his reconciliation Wilfrid was forced to flee from York to the king of the Mercians who appointed him Bishop of Leicester.

At the Council of Estrefeld in 702 Wilfrid was condemned and excommunicated by Brihtwald, who had succeeded Theodore in the See of Canterbury. Eddius' account of this Council describes it as a revival of scheming injustices perpetrated against Wilfrid.⁹ In the year 704 Wilfrid appealed in person to Rome for the second time, and for a second time he received a favorable decision from the papal tribunal. The Council of Rome under John VI declared his acquittal and commanded Brihtwald to convene a synod which would render a canonical decision with respect to the sees of which Wilfrid had been deprived.¹⁰ On the same occasion Pope John VI addressed a letter to Ethelred, King of the Mercians, and to Ealdfrith, King of the Northumbrians, in which he informed them that he had commanded

⁵ Hadden and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, III, 137.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 139.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 170.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 171.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 251.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 256.

³ *England and Rome*, 25.

⁴ *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, PL, CLXXIX, 1559.

Brihtwald to convene a synod, or else to appear in Rome there to have the question finally settled.¹¹

Brihtwald complied with the order of John VI and convened the synod on the Nidd in the following year, 705, where he explained to the assembly the command of the Apostolic See. The interpretation which Brihtwald accorded the papal command left anything but an impression of disregard for the jurisdiction of Rome.¹² It would be unhistorical to conclude from the *acta* of this synod that the case of Wilfrid illustrated anything but the ecclesiastical obedience of the Anglo-Saxon Church to the Roman See. True it is that some of the bishops present at the synod on the Nidd objected to the reinstatement of Wilfrid on the ground that it would be contrary to the decrees of Theodore and to the ruling of Ealdfrith. But it was left to the Abbess Aelfleda to effect a settlement. She narrated before the synod that on his deathbed King Ealdfrith had experienced a change of heart and mind in Wilfrid's regard; that the king had confessed that justice had not been done to the exiled Bishop of York; and that he desired his successor in the kingship of Northumbria to restore Wilfrid to his rightful possessions.¹³ Berechfrith, one of the royal princes, corroborated the statements of the abbess, when in the same synod he admitted that the deceased king of Northumbria

expressed before he died a wish that the mandate of the Roman See be entirely obeyed.¹⁴

Ealdfrith was succeeded by Ealdwulf, who usurped the throne of Northumbria for two months, and who treated Wilfrid in even a harsher manner than had his predecessor. But when Osred finally took the throne, Pope John VI's plan was finally realized.

Wilfrid never did actually obtain possession of the See of York as it was before the controversy arose. After the final settlement the see was of a diminished size. But the principles for which he contended at last triumphed after long and bitter struggling.

The conflict of Wilfrid, then, viewed in its proper perspective and as a whole, appears very different from what many Anglican historians would wish it to appear. A superficial study of the case would lend some force to the argument that it was clear illustration of Anglo-Saxon opposition to Roman jurisdiction. But the more detailed study of the motives, which probably inaugurated the strife between Wilfrid and his adversaries and which prompted the stubborn and long continued refusal of the English hierarchy to obey the commands of the Apostolic See to restore Wilfrid to the bishopric of York, and of the final outcome of the controversy, reveal a case far different from what is universally made out of it by historians of the English Church. Far from illustrating an ecclesiastical organization in Anglo-Saxon England which asserted its independence from Rome, the case of Wilfrid unmistakably indicates the exact opposite, the subjection of the Anglo-Saxon Church to the See of Peter.

De Maistre: Freemason and Ultramontane

(Continued from page forty-eight)

found at once "sublime, heretical and absurd." He was right in his zeal for deeper knowledge; he was extremely ill-advised in the ways along which he sought to penetrate the secrets of heaven. Freemasons, Illuminati, Martinists put forth a hodge-podge of symbols and vague aspirations, which, after all, did seem to promise a brighter future for humanity. And de Maistre the fervent apostle of human progress was for a time won over to schemes for betterment which did credit to his heart, but not to his head. Throughout his life he will retain a sort of mystical straining toward higher truth. Whatever his faults in the dreamland of eighteenth century Enlightenment, he succeeded in good time in shaking himself free from earlier vagaries. His Masonic career is an episode in the life of a Catholic whose mistakes were due to the unrestrained eagerness of a great soul in promoting human well-being. Judged by the clear teaching of the popes of the past hundred years, formulated in encyclicals, syllabi, and the decrees of the Vatican Council, de Maistre was often radically wrong. But in the cloudy atmosphere of the Revolutionary Era no such aids were at hand to guide his thought, his actions and his pen.

The "Complete Works" of Joseph de Maistre were published in fourteen volumes at Lyon, France, in 1884-1886. Readers will, of course, differ in their preferences, and critics will dispute the relative merits of the volumes. For many *du Pape* will rank first for its intrinsic worth as well as for its influence in Ultramontane circles. More

neutral observers have pronounced *les soirées de Saint-Petersbourg* the real masterpiece. Père George Longhay, for whose literary judgment we have a high regard, finds in de Maistre a letter writer superior to Madame Sévigné. It is well to have the word of a competent Frenchman on the matter of comparative "style"; any foreigner of moderate intelligence can form his own conclusions regarding the more elevated tone of de Maistre's thought. The importance of a correspondence, which fills eight volumes of the *Oeuvres complètes*, will be readily seen when one recalls the wide European contacts of the writer and the stirring times in which he wrote. If there were question of the fundamental sincerity of de Maistre, the informality of occasional letters might afford a deeper insight into his real self. Here, however, it will suffice to note that the casual remarks of the letter writer are in no way inconsistent with the more formal pose of the author of books. The same remark applies to the scattered and still unedited fragments which have come to light since the publication of the *Oeuvres complètes*.

The mature mind of de Maistre was in close touch with the world of men and things around him. At the same time, the philosopher could wrestle with his profound thoughts in a realm aloof from the passing scene. There is never lacking a wealth of concrete illustration and allusion, which makes it easy to read the longer works continuously without fatigue. On the other hand, one who skims the pages will be arrested by the ever recurring

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 262-264.

¹² *Ibid.*, 265.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 266.

¹⁴ *Idem*.

themes: France and her "satanic revolution"; sovereignty and constitutions; religion and the Church; and through all and over all the workings of divine Providence.

Among the major writings of de Maistre *Considérations sur la France* is first in order of time. In the London edition of 1797 it is a book of 246 pages. Lausanne, where it was first published in 1796, was close enough to the whirlwind of tragic action to enable the writer to report events with the authority of a contemporary witness, and yet aloof enough to provide the proper perspective and sufficient security for the philosopher. The main thesis of the book can be stated in a few short phrases: France, unfaithful to her high mission, failing in her vocation and demoralizing the rest of Europe, was being chastized by Divine Providence. Men, mediocre for the most part, were the perverse yet helpless instruments of a mighty force. But there is much more in the book. Page upon page of quotable paragraphs could be assembled. Even a mere summary of flashes which reveal the author's philosophical insight would carry us beyond the scope of this paper. Too enthusiastic for the Old Régime, de Maistre, the born aristocrat, was not blind to its defects. His philosophy of history is as little likely to be popular today as it is needed to right the secularist view of the past.

The opening paragraph announces a view of historic events and of humanity which will sound strange to modern ears: "We are all bound to the throne of the Supreme Being by an elastic chain which holds us firmly, but does not enslave us." Free in our actions, we are yet impotent to change the divine plan. Men are more led than leading in a movement like the Revolution. They assert their liberty, and become its victims. Anti-Christian writers could excite the forces of destruction; their disciples are powerless to control them. Philosophy, essentially a dissolving leaven, cannot build a new society. An enduring work of God can be done only by men who are in contact with Him. The Church, chastened by the confiscation of her property and the sufferings of her non-juring clergy, will be purified for future triumphs.

As a political theorist, de Maistre reminds us of Edmund Burke, whose *Reflections on the French Revolution* preceded the *Considérations* by five years. Characteristically, however, he groups his ideas in a chapter under the caption: "De l'influence divine sur les constitutions politiques." Every nation, he tells us, "has a natural constitution; written constitutions are just so much paper." France had her natural constitution, balanced, fluctuating, but not static. The Revolution pretended to legislate for "Man." De Maistre has known "Frenchmen, Italians, Russians," but no such being as "Man" has ever existed. Even America, the land of experiment, affords no example of legislators starting with a *tabula rasa*. They had their colonial heritage: belief in God and religion, political traditions and the elements of a constitution borrowed from England. In thirteen points, he sets forth his ideas on constitution-making.

Constitutions, he tells us, cannot arise from deliberation. God employs men as He employs other circumstances to realize His own plans. Popular rights are from the sovereign; monarchy and aristocracy are a natural growth. The king himself is part of a system independent

of his will. Written laws merely declare existing rights. The more voluminous the writing, the more feeble is the institution. No nation gives itself liberty unless already in possession of liberty. At a crucial moment the man of Providence appears to legislate. The legislator, akin to the priest, merely assembles pre-existing laws. Liberty is the gift of kings. Written constitutions merely develop the natural constitution. No assembly can make a nation. Not the savants, not reason, but instinct and impulse and moral force are the vital elements in the making a constitution. This compressed digest does not do justice to the author. It is, however, typical of a great mind which saw through the utopias of the Revolution, and at the same time clung to real values of the Old Régime.

Les soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg is a two-volume work, first published in 1821. The title vaguely suggests the character of the work. The sub-title informs us that we have here a series of conversations on the "temporal rule of Divine Providence." A Russian Senator, a French Knight and a Count, who is de Maistre himself, engage in eleven more or less casual conversations on a variety of topics. The scene is laid on the banks of Neva. This simple device affords the author an opportunity to set forth his views on profound philosophical problems without wearying the reader. One need read only a few pages to be convinced that he has before him the fruit of a long life of deep thinking, wide reading and acute observation. If he wants further evidence, it is at hand in the abundant notes and references which accompany each conversation.

The symposium opens when the Senator proposes a discussion of "the prosperity of the wicked and the misery of the just." To remove this anomaly, which has ever been a stumbling-block for the reason of man, the group undertakes to explore the whole range of God's action in the moral world. But is there any connection between happiness and crime? And are the virtuous unhappy? For de Maistre temporal good and evil are drawn by individuals as it were in a lottery. God can wait until the day of final reckoning. If the just man suffers, he suffers because he is a man. Evil has entered the universe as a result of sin. Suffering expiates sin. It serves to heal human perversity. And so on, through two volumes de Maistre shares his erudition and his reflections on the world about him. But the discussion is not allowed to become merely academic. De Maistre is too close to the flood of blasphemy and impiety which had deluged France to be content with generalities. He flays the moulders of the Revolutionary mind. The diabolic cleverness of Voltaire and the dreamy half-wisdom of Rousseau would be less effective if a world predisposed to agree with them would read the *Soirées*. The stature of the *Philosophes* shrinks visibly under the withering criticism of de Maistre.

Supplementing the *Soirées*, a disquisition on the place of "Sacrifice" in human life helps to clarify this baffling and forbidding topic. Through seventy pages, largely made up of quotations, side-remarks and footnote references, the author surveys sacrifice in general, the pagan idea of sacrifice and the Christian philosophy in which the mystery is solved. This layman penning a literary work writes like a Father of the Church explaining pas-

sages of Holy Scripture. Later critics have been horrified at statements scattered through de Maistre's works, which seem to justify and approve so much that is repellant to the Humanitarian. De Maistre sees a redemptive virtue in the shedding of blood. He sees also the value of vicarious suffering and of death. The difference between him and the shallow Rationalists who criticize him or are unmercifully criticized by him lies in the fact that he is a philosopher reaching out to grasp the totality of things and striving to explain the world as God made it.

Most familiar to English readers of de Maistre is his classic on the papacy. First published in 1819, the book appeared in English translation in 1850. It can still be read with profit, though as a piece of apologetics it has been definitely shelved by the exhaustive and inspired work of the Vatican Council. The book was smoke in the nostrils of a moribund Gallicanism. It gave heart to a rising Ultramontanism. The author undertakes to do for a discredited clergy what the clergy could scarcely do in its own cause. His arguments were not conclusive, but he was a pioneer in a society that was not strong on logic, and like his contemporary Chateaubriand he convinced his readers. He defended the truth effectively, and lovers of the truth can afford to defend him now. To state his major thesis in his own words: "No human society can exist without government nor government without sovereignty, nor sovereignty without infallibility." The Church with its "divinely promised" infallibility is vastly superior to other sovereignties in which infallibility is "humanly supposed." The proof of the thesis, both historical and on rational grounds, is carried through four

sections in which the pope's relations with the Church, the state, civilization and the schismatical churches are reviewed.

There is, perhaps, no more famous dictum of de Maistre than his often quoted: "For three hundred years history has been a conspiracy against truth." But he gave very little attention to writers of history. His sharpest barbs were hurled at the thinkers most high in honor a hundred years ago. Against Francis Bacon he wrote a whole book. Both Locke and Bacon he considered at best mediocre thinkers, whose influence was for the most part harmful. Toward the whole tribe of pre-Revolutionary French writers he displayed almost unmitigated contempt. Sure of himself and of the cause he championed, de Maistre was magnanimous enough to recognize talent and ability in any adversary. But he was intolerant of false doctrines and fallacious reasoning. The Church, and the Church alone, he contended, could stand the test of "science," an acid which dissolves all metals except gold. He was at once conscious of security and of social disintegration. "No sovereign power," he wrote, "is strong enough to govern many millions of men unless aided by religion, or by slavery." God was the sole principle of right and duty, of social life and of individual dignity. As at the present day, the great question was: Shall the state be religious or atheist? De Maistre directed his best efforts toward the preservation of society. Throughout life he worked for the restoration of religious unity. In this he was fore-doomed to failure. He was more effective in building the Kingdom of God in individual souls.

Primo de Rivera: Benevolent Dictator

(Continued from page fifty)

Andalucía, Viscaya, the Asturias. Its centers were Coruña, Madrid, Valladolid. It copied the technique of the French syndicalists and the Russian terrorists. Their review, *Revista Blanca*, spread the ideas of Kropotkin, Max Stirner, Nietzsche. Philosophical anarchism attracted Unamuno and Azorín. The strikes of 1901-04 were the result of anarchist activity, but the anarchists became divided by internal quarrels. To restore their influence, they decided in 1910 to organize the C. N. T. (Confederación Nacional del Trabajo) in 1910, and in 1917 this joined the U. G. T. in a popular front to force from the ministry their minimum program. This front elected to the Cortes Besteiro, Largo Caballero, and Indalecio Prieto. In 1921 the socialists held a congress to consider the demands of the Third International which had laid down minimum conditions to be accepted by all parties. Under the leadership of Iglesias and de los Rios this was refused, and it was then that the Communist group was formed in Viscaya under Facunda Perezagua.

As to the part played by Masonry, it was perhaps most influential at first in army circles. Under the influence of Wellington's Army, many of whom were Masons, the Spanish army became largely Masonic. Masonry furnished the intellectual leaders of the Constituent Cortes and was largely influential in putting over the Liberal State. The Supreme Council of Masonry presented to the provisional government of 1868 the following pro-

gram: Liberty of cults; suppression of the religious orders and associations of charity (i. e. Daughters of Charity, etc.); secularization of cemeteries; civil marriage; military service for the clergy; abolition of celibacy; the number of churches to be regulated by the State and the nationalization of church property.

The main lodges were in Gijón, Barcelona, Alicante, Seville and Madrid. With the advent of Francisco Ferrer the lodges took a more active part in politics. Ferrer had affiliated with the Grand Orient in 1901 and had set up his headquarters in Barcelona, where he opened his modern school in elaborate style. Here he propagated atheistic doctrines and made money speculating with his Jewish banking connections. The World War rather disorganized international Masonry and in Spain it was more or less obliged to start on a fresh basis. Cataluña became the special field for operations. In 1883 there were 18 lodges; in 1922, 10; in 1927, 42; and in 1931, 52. An effort was evidently made to distribute membership as widely as possible among the different social groups, for according to a report for Andalucía published in 1926, of the 1059 members, 455 belonged to the bourgeoisie, 604 to the salaried and wage classes. Many of the Leftist party were in these lodges.

During 1926-27 there either rejoined or entered anew Fernando de los Rios, Jiménez Asúa, Luis Bello, Ramón Gómez de la Serna, Fernando Velasco, Luis Araquistáin,

R. Salazar, Alvaro de Albornoz, Marcelino Domínguez, Alejandro Lerroux, Ortega y Gasset. Diego Martínez Barrio became grand master of the Grand Orient.

Macià who planned to establish a Catalan state and who engineered the celebrated Basque-Catalan accord, went to Russia where he was well received and given much help. On his return to Barcelona, however, he did not seem to advance very much and was advised to join the Masons which he did in 1926. Several Catalans went to Russia: Gassol, Ramis, Fontberbat, Campolans, Xirau, Bordes. Communist speeches began to be heard and their ideas taught in the Catalan schools. Luis Campanys founded *La Humanità* as a vehicle for these ideas, modeled on the style of *L'Humanité* which had been founded by several French Jews, among them Lévy-Bruhl, Picard and Léon Blum.

It might be asked what were the Catholics doing all this time. Catholic movements were always greatly handicapped by the obstacles put in the way by "Liberal" laws, so full of contradictions and vagueness. The Church in Spain was never free to undertake properly the reforms and measures she knew to be necessary.⁵ Take the matter of parishes alone. In Madrid in the Tetuán section there were 110,000 souls and two parishes. For 800,000 people there were thirty parishes in 1931. In all the large cities of Spain the clergy were concentrated in the centers, the suburbs were left practically abandoned, and thus the mass of workers was hardly ever reached, thanks to government restrictions. In the rural districts the poverty of the clergy was too great for any extensive program.

But the anarchist-socialist movements had much greater freedom to act and had reached so many that, as stated above, by the World War it became more and more impossible to maintain the fiction of the Liberal State. All during 1922 terrorism was open in Barcelona. Affairs in Morocco had reached a climax. On March 19, 1923, Salvador Seguí was assassinated in Barcelona. On June 4, Cardinal Soldevilla of Valencia was also assassinated. On July 13, Domínguez, president of one of the syndicates of the Bank of Barcelona was also murdered. Battles were constant between the associations of workingmen and those of employers. The debates over these events in the Cortes proved the feebleness of the government.

It was under these circumstances that Primo de Rivera took the helm of government. The outstanding factor was that the socialists were strong enough and vocal enough, and the country was just sufficiently secularized, to give the subversive elements weight and to wreck the Dictatorship. Primo de Rivera had little choice, and so he made terms with the socialists. A truce was arranged. Alcalá Zamora and Ossorio y Gallardo accepted the dictatorship, and he began his reforms.

Morocco claimed his first attention and gave him the opportunity to reform the army, but also to the socialists it was their opportunity to rally against him all the anti-war cries, more potent abroad than in Spain. He moved against the socialists and politicians by ending the provincial councils, the particular nest and center of politicians.

To appreciate why this was so and what it meant for Spain, and thus to understand "the plague of Caciquismo," it must be kept in mind that in Spain ever since

the Reconquest the democratic self-government, and it was very real self-government, was centered in the municipios. This institution goes back to Roman days and formed a local rural-urban unit governed by councils in each sector. This system declined very much under the French Bourbon Kings but did not quite die. At the time of the Cortes of 1812 it was proposed to kill it—for it was the bulwark against tyranny and centralism—and the whole of the nineteenth century saw the battle to accomplish this. The attempt was made to impose the arbitrary Napoleonic system of prefectures under Spanish names, centralized in Madrid. The law artificially creating these was passed in 1821 and amended, set aside, and restored many times between that date and 1882, but a general scheme remained constant and not greatly changed at later dates. The central government authorized the creation of provinces and municipios (neither of which had anything to do with the old geographical divisions or the traditional political life of the people). The provinces were governed by *diputaciones* and the municipios by *ayuntamientos*. At the head of the first were the *jefes políticos* and of the latter *alcaldes*, royal appointees (i. e. by the Cabinet). These councils were elected by those who had the vote and the Cortes set the conditions for this. The whole system was subject to the Minister of gobernación in the Cabinet, and the provincial councils were go-betweens for him. It can easily be seen how the politicians would inevitably use such a scheme, how it controlled the government of Spain, and why he who would rule Spain had to control the Cortes through the Cabinet. By the same token all the serious, able and patriotic Spaniards felt themselves obliged to withdraw from politics. It was impossible to beat the system (for there were many laws and devices closing up the loop-holes) and to enter it was to become contaminated or defeated.

It was this entrenched preserve of the professional politician which the socialists were now entering, that Primo de Rivera aimed to destroy with his decrees. A howl of criticism in the vocabulary of democracy was hurled against him and to silence such criticism that was merely destructive, he exiled Unamuno, Soriano, Jiménez de Asúa, García del Real, Fernando de los Ríos, professors at the University of Madrid who were engineering the student uprisings, but thanks to the aid furnished by M. Dumay, editor of *Quotidien* the exiles escaped to Paris and joined with Ortega y Gasset and Blasco Ibañez in a campaign against him.

Primo de Rivera saw it was imperative to have some kind of a party upon which he could rely for support, or through which he could put his reforms into execution. He did not want a political party, the uselessness of which experience had amply proved, so he tried to form what was really a national group made up of all groups united by their patriotism. To this group he gave the name *Unión patriótica*. For this he has been much blamed. It was an error of statesmanship from one point of view to include so many diverse elements. The bulk of the *Unión* was conservative but there were many Liberals in it. To include the Left elements was bound to wreck it. He thought to silence them by associating them with reform, but it was not reform that they wanted. He was not able to crush them for he had no army. In any case, it was

⁵ Cf. *The Catholic Church in Contemporary Europe*, loc. cit.

certainly a serious weakness to include in the council of State a man like Largo Caballero.

He hoped to get from the *Unión* candidates for the elections to a constituent Cortes, but his opponents had no intention of allowing this to pass. His visit to Santiago de Compostela enraged the Left groups. The censorship aroused the pious wrath of Maura, Alcaíá Zamora, Melquíades Alvarez, Bonilla San Martín and the news writers generally. Despite this, only Cataluña which never supported him objected to his Provisional Statute of Government.

All during 1925 there were student uprisings, keeping alive the slogans of freedom of speech. Military juntas were formed against him. He tried a semi-civil administration with the Cabinet of December, 1925, which included the Duke de Tetúan, Admiral Cornejo, Calvo Sotelo (finance), Yanguas (foreign affairs), Callejo (education), Galo Ponte (justice), Martines Anido (governación), Aunos of the Catalan league (public works). The Left objected most to Galo Ponte and Callejo, but soon the financial measures of Calvo Sotelo which were in the nature of a real revolution and reconstruction, aroused the bitter antagonism of the powerful entrenched financial and banking groups.

With the censorship enforced, opposition crept underground and was spread through the New School and the *Alianza republicana* in which were Alejandro Lerroux and Marcelino Domínguez, and the *Acción republicana* led by Manuel Azaña. Primo de Rivera tried to reform the artillery corps, strongly Masonic, and planned a parliamentary assembly representative of all classes and interests. The plebiscite for him was 6,697,164 in September, 1926. Macía started an uprising in Cataluña but this was put down and Macía exiled.

His plan of a Parliament representative of all interests and classes (reminiscent of the old medieval Cortes), was a radical departure from Liberal practice (orientated as it was by the French idea of representing individuals) and of the socialist idea of representing groups (not classes or interests). If successful it would oppose a formidable dike against the anarchist and socialist propaganda and action. Hence every effort was made to defeat it. Sánchez-Guerra took the lead in opposition and raised the cry for the defense of the old legally established Constitution of 1876. The whole point of the Dictatorship of course was to liquidate this very thing, but the slogan was powerful and again more in foreign countries than in Spain.

The Assembly opened in September, 1927. All the members were approved by Primo de Rivera, but again he was weak and allowed Indalecio Prieto to attend it. Sánchez-Guerra however went to Paris in protest. The Assembly was so heterogeneous that debate got nowhere and to push it towards some conclusion Primo de Rivera took direct action in it, which aroused against him more cries of tyrant and dictator. However, what really turned out to be the rocks on which the Dictatorship foundered were the laws on education and the reform of the artillery corps.

On March 19, 1928, Callejo, Minister of Education, published his University Statute in which the Universities of El Escorial and Deusto were granted the same privi-

leges as the State Universities. The value of this to the Catholics was too great for the Left to let it go unchallenged. The biggest opposition yet was now staged against him, dramatized by student strikes and the arrest of Sbert who was imprisoned and thus became a martyr. The universities were closed and again Ortega y Gasset, Fernando de los Rios and Asúa raised the cry of academic freedom.

Meantime Primo de Rivera fought hard for his constitution shaping up along the lines which foreshadowed a corporate state based on old democratic ideas of a functional social order. There was a great reunion of republicans, the formation of a radical socialist party and the Academy of Jurisprudence refused to support him. The financiers took a hand, prepared a coup and forced down the peseta. The King turned against him, and Primo de Rivera gave up. Nevertheless the six years of his rule accomplished solid things. He saved Morocco. The importance of this is not yet popularly grasped, beclouded as it is by British propaganda. He failed to restore a democratic social order, but he destroyed absolutely the compromise of a Liberal State, and lovers of truth will long remember him for this. He educated the people to real issues and he opened the way for the show-down, sooner perhaps than his enemies had wished. He died alone, on foreign soil, but he returned to be buried in the Spain he had honored. The people met his cortege with mournful tears. Alas, did they weep for him, or was it for their lost opportunity? In Divine Providence, however, the seeds of victory are sown in tears.

Pictorial Forgeries

Harold J. McAuliffe

Can you detect frauds and misrepresentations in pictorial and sculptural history? Would it occur to you that an oil painting on canvas and stretcher, bearing this title, "View of the Island of Runnymede, painted at the time of the signing of Magna Charta," is an anachronism, since the practice of mixing pigments with oil was not followed at that early period, nor was canvas used as a surface on which to paint? Would the reflections of an historian on the inestimable value of an 1805 "photograph" stir your critical attitude of mind? Such reflections might, if you recalled that this inestimably valuable "photograph" antedated considerably the inventions of Niepce and Daguerre.

Would you meekly allow an artist to represent American Indians bearing quivers, not of skin or of wickerwork, but of metal of classical design, which might have graced Trajan's column or the arch of Constantine? Champlain's habitations of Quebec and Port Royal, thrown up in a hurry, were most probably wooden constructions, with perhaps a little masonry for foundations, fireplaces, and chimneys, surrounded by log palisades. Would an engraving of these habitations, suggestive of massive masonry ramparts and houses, offend your eye? Are you satisfied with Paul Kane's Indian pictures? Notice that his Indian chief suggests the statue of Apollo Belvedere, beau-ideal of the mid-nineteenth-century connoisseur and that his horses are not Indian ponies but Arab steeds careering with the outspread legs of the race-horse of the sporting prints of the period.

Benjamin West's "Death of Wolfe" might lose some of its appeal if it were generally known that few of the personages shown in the picture were actually present at Wolfe's death, and that some were not even in the battle of the Plains. Does it not seem strange to you that the dying hero, Brock, should be tangled in drapery, and that the naked Indian at his side should be carrying a ponderous battle-axe of which a Roman hero might have been proud?

Would you notice the inconsistencies in the well-known portrait of Jeffery Amherst which depicts him in plate armour of the sixteenth century or earlier, while a helmet with visor rests upon a map of Canada beside him? His sash and jewel of the Order of the Bath, his eighteenth-century wig, and, in the background, his boats descending the rapids of the St. Lawrence are hardly consonant with plate armour and helmet and visor.

Have you accepted as authentic and contemporary the portraits that passed for likenesses of Cartier, of Frontenac, and of Champlain? Margry, Myrand, and Biggar have demolished the authenticity and contemporaneity of these portraits. Are you satisfied with the face of Champlain? Professor Wrong discarded it from his school histories years ago with the incisive comment that "the man with that face never discovered anything." One laughs at seeing Champlain holding the astrolabe by the base. Imagine him stepping into a birch-bark canoe or climbing a slippery Georgian Bay rock accoutered with breast-plate and heavy boots reaching above the knee!

Charles W. Jefferys calls our attention to these frauds and misrepresentations in pictorial and sculptural history ("The Visual Reconstruction of History," *The Canadian Historical Review*, September, 1936).

One should develop a critical attitude of mind in regard to historical pictures. For a just and accurate criticism "some knowledge of printing processes is required. Often the process used in reproducing a picture will give a clue as to its authenticity as a contemporary work." Frequently artistic misrepresentation is due to the "engraver's ignorance of the subject depicted, to his inadequate skill, to the aesthetic conventions of his time." In criticising the work of an artist who was bound by the aesthetic conventions of his particular period, we must not be too severe; for, after all, "Every period has its artistic conventions; even the most original artist can speak only in the idiom of his time. . . . We accept the convention; but such portraits cause confusion in the minds of youthful students and casual readers, unless accompanied by some commentary from those who know and can explain."

An artist must be able to seize character, he must have integrity of vision. "So far as Canada is concerned, such early portraits as exist are nearly all of them nebulous or feeble in characterization. . . . To the limited perception and halting execution of the mediocre artist must be added the vanity of the sitter; and thus many of our historic personages probably exist for us today more as they wished to look than as they really appeared."

"In the absence of genuine portraits from life, it is inevitable that some form of imaginative pictorial personification will come into existence. If these portraits are acknowledged to be ideal representations, the ethics of history are safeguarded; the criticism of such works

must then change its approach, and the questions to be asked are whether the artist's version seems consonant with the known character of the person represented, with his occupation, and his environment.

The writer, as already noted, does not confine himself to the problems which confront the pictorial illustrator of history; he deals with the problems which confront the ordinary reader and student of history. Faulty perspective and incorrect proportions interfere with the clear reading of many old drawings and engravings; many articles in museums have a "pedigree . . . largely traditional, the legacies of earlier and less critical or less informed days." In Canada there is no adequate collection of birch-bark canoes, snow-shoes, and genuine antique stoves; "Many pre-European objects especially have been lost. . . . If any pre-European objects, such as bows, quivers, shields, quill- and wampum-embroidered garments still exist, is it possible that they may be found in Europe, rather than in America?"

. . . Opinions regarding the value of imaginative pictures inevitably will differ; but it may be claimed that they serve a useful, if minor, purpose in arousing popular interest in historical subjects. . . . For the artist of real creative power and insight, the greater the number of essential facts known, the more clearly he sees their connection and significance, and the more intense generally is his visualization.

. . . Despite its [the motion picture's] many banalities, obvious and repellant as they are, it must be admitted that the motion picture today presents, especially in its visual features, an authentic and vivid re-creation of the past. . . . If the popular imagination is touched and stirred, ultimately it will have some effect upon the public purse, with resultant benefit to higher historical studies. . . . Perhaps, too, the presentation of history in visible, tangible form may have even some direct bearing upon the work of the scholar, in directing his attention to those minor and apparently trivial details of weather, locality, time and place, tools, weapons, clothes, and the fashions of physical adornment: all matters of prime importance to the illustrator, and not without significance to the student of social life, past or present."

EDITORIAL (Continued)

(Continued from page fifty-two)

tures augmented by a few gruesome shots from the Bolshevik Revolution. This was, of course, history, but history as Hollywood might present it. It told us quite as much about Soviet publicity as it did about actual conditions in "Utopia." We can only hope that not too many in the audience failed to be critical.

In this editorial the Catholic Historical Association has been treated as an integral part of the larger historical guild. For those who followed the Catholic program closely the chief performers were, aside from those already mentioned, Sr. M. Ambrose, B. V. M.; Sr. M. Eva, O. P.; and Sr. M. Celeste, R. S. M.; Dr. Edward P. Lilly and Dr. Paul R. Conroy; Rt. Rev., Very Rev., and Rev. Thomas V. Shannon, J. Gerald Kealy, Edward V. Cardinal, Michael J. O'Connell, John Hugh O'Donnell, Mathias Braun and John J. Laux and John M. Lenhart. Dr. Carlos E. Castañeda was elected president, and Mr. Herbert H. Coulson, first vice-president.

Book Reviews

The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner, with an Introduction by Fulmer Mood. Madison. University of Wisconsin Press. 1938. pp. 315. \$3.50.

This volume, one of the first to be published by the University of Wisconsin Press, is a tribute to a great teacher by admiring disciples. It contains, besides the famous essay, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," three comparatively unknown works of Frederick Jackson Turner: "The Significance of History," "Problems in American History," and "The Character and Influence of the Indian Trade in Wisconsin." These are given in chronological order for the purpose of indicating the gradual evolution of the Frontier Hypothesis for which Turner is especially known. While all are of interest the first has the wider appeal; the last, Turner's doctoral dissertation, is a fine example of thorough scholarship, but like most dissertations it necessarily appeals to a limited audience.

Fulmer Mood has contributed as an introductory essay a study entitled "Turner's Formative Period," a thorough analysis of the progressive growth of the historian's great idea. It is the result of a workman-like bit of investigation into the less known writings of Turner, his syllabuses hidden away in the University catalogues, and his contacts with the various persons who influenced him in his younger days. It might be classified as a psychological-historical study. While we do not wish to belittle the widely acclaimed Frontier Hypothesis we cannot help feeling that the ardor of Mood's devotion is a bit extreme.

Everett E. Edwards has compiled a complete bibliography of Turner's writings and has arranged it in chronological order. The greater part of this list consists of book reviews and syllabuses. For one interested in tracing the development of Turner's Frontier Hypothesis this bibliography will be of great assistance.

GREGORY C. HUGER.

Chateaubriand, Poet, Statesman, Lover, by André Maurois. New York. Harper & Brothers. 1938. pp. x & 352. \$3.50.

François René de Chateaubriand stands at the beginning of the resurgence of Catholic life in France after the Revolution. His *Génie du Christianisme* is a great piece of literature. Its influence was due quite as much to its timeliness as to its marvelous style. In an age when perverted emotion had fed upon unsubstantial things until it reached a state akin to religious starvation, a portrayal of the beauties of Christianity, uncritical, exaggerated, bombastic even, was bound to produce happy results. A Christian Rousseau could demolish the hollow Rationalism of a Voltairean society and inject a wholesome antiseptic into the diseased sentimentality of the Rousseauvians. Chateaubriand enjoys a high place among the literary men of the age of Romanticism. He also ranks high among the defenders of the Church at a time when the Church needed defenders. But if the Church could be proud of her champion, his admirers can still weep over the moral lapses which seem so out of harmony with his deep religious convictions.

Chateaubriand was a year older than Napoleon. He survived the fall of the Empire by thirty-three years. In 1802 the two men worked together the restoration of religion in France. For the most part, however, they were rivals. And, in general, the writer was the more haughty and the less conciliating whenever they disagreed. Chateaubriand was twenty-one when the Revolution began. He died at the age of eighty during the February Revolution of 1848. Lover of the sea, traveler, exile in England or America, his wild youth brought sorrow to his pious mother. Even after his conversion to better ways, though as minister and ambassador he held positions of importance, though he was much in the public eye, though he continued to turn out great literature, his biography is largely the story of his amours with an army of women who seemed to tread on one another's heels in their efforts to please him. Chateaubriand was a bundle of anomalies. André Maurois has given us a survey of contrasts and contradictions which, in spite of delicate handling, should be listed: "for adults only."

R. CORRIGAN.

McGillivray of the Creeks, by John Walton Caughey. Norman, Oklahoma. Oklahoma University Press. 1938. pp. xvi & 385. \$3.50.

While engaged in research in the *Archivo de Indias* at Seville, Mr. Caughey discovered a valuable and significant bundle of letters written by Alexander McGillivray to the various Spanish

officials along the border of Florida and Louisiana. In this book we are given the more important letters of this collection, along with others from various American archives, many of which are published for the first time.

Alexander McGillivray, "Creek Patriot" and son of a Scottish father, had his education abruptly ended with the banishment of his father for Loyalist sympathies at the outbreak of the American Revolution. Going back to his Indian people he rises, during that critical decade following the Revolution, to become the head of the Creek nation, not by military qualities, but through his remarkable gifts for astute diplomacy. He seems to have exerted an almost despotic control over a region half again as large as modern Alabama at a time when the Spanish and American governments were intriguing for control. Taking full advantage of the potentialities of the Creek's position, he placed this nation on a parity with the other two powers, and thereby gained for himself international fame. Theodore Roosevelt styled him the "Tallyrand of Alabama," and Pickett pronounced him "the most gifted and remarkable man that ever was born upon the soil of Alabama."

The man reveals himself in his letters, and this makes interesting reading. But, with international rivalries, with British trade and intrigue, with Spain's changing but vigorous policies, with the early difficulties of the United States, all fusing and surging about this central figure, the letters become more than interesting, they become fascinating reading. Mr. Caughey has done a remarkably fine job in editing these letters, and includes an excellent brief biography of the man. The University of Oklahoma Press is making a valuable contribution to history by its "Civilization of the American Indian" series.

N. P. LOEHR.

The History of St. Louis, by Jean, Sire de Joinville, Seneschal of Champagne. Translated from the French Text edited by Natalis de Wailly by Joan Evans. New York. Oxford University Press. 1938. pp. xxviii + 281. \$3.00.

As Miss Evans states in her Preface this translation has already appeared in an *edition de luxe* from the Gregynog Press. The Natalis de Wailly edition (1874) appears to be the best modern French text of this famous work, the translations by Ethel Wedgewood (London, 1906) and Sir F. Marzials (London, 1908) being hitherto accepted as the best English editions. Miss Evans' translation has received high praise as being a faithful translation which conveys the spirit of the thirteenth century by close adherence to the style of the original. She has written a valuable introduction in which she compares Joinville's *History* with Lawrence's *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, gives us an account of the life of Joinville and of how the *History* came to be written, points out what are the original chapters and what were added for edification, and analyses the character of Joinville as a feudal knight. There are extensive notes which, on the whole, should prove of value to the reader. The usefulness of the translation may be summed up in the words of the translator, "When we have read Joinville's book we do not know very much of the history of the reign of Louis IX: but we do know both the king and Joinville himself as individuals of remarkable character."

H. H. COULSON.

The French Revolution, as Told by Contemporaries, by E. L. Higgins. New York. Houghton Mifflin Company. 1938. pp. x and 463. \$2.75.

History teachers have found it hard to pick a suitable text for a course in the French Revolution. This should be a very simple matter. Why not blindfold the class, and let each student pick his own text? A fair-sized class could be thus equipped without exhausting the available supply of fairly good presentations of the story. Differences are for the most part accidental. The variety should be stimulating to the instructor, as well as to the students. If this sounds revolutionary, it need not affect our critique of *The French Revolution, as told by contemporaries*. This book is different, and it is not a text book.

Here are a thousand or more selections from approximately a hundred contemporary sources. Not every, perhaps not any document is a photographic image of the persons, events or movements described. But each document does bring the reader close to the man or woman who wrote it. Memoirs, for example, provide the major portion of the compiler's material, and everybody knows that memoirs are misleading when the injudicious read them.

But the memoir is, at least, a reflection of the writer's subjective state, and this subjective state is itself an historical fact, and often enough it is important.

In this strange medley of the vicious and the doubtfully virtuous, of ambition, passion, corruption, discontent, envy and brutality on the one hand, and of enthusiasm and high ideals on the other, there is the freshness of the living human touch. The book is easy to read, either in part or continuously. Its value, however, will depend largely upon the critical acumen of the student, which may be native and spontaneous, or may be aroused by an alert instructor for the occasion. If there are "lies, and—more lies and statistics," there are also "documents"! These last are often like the evidence a clever lawyer presents for a purpose. But Professor Higgins is not a special pleader. His well-chosen and abundant documents can be very helpful. The book deserves a place in the college library. R. CORRIGAN.

Saint Dominique: L'Idée, L'Homme et L'Oeuvre, by Pierre Mandonnet, O. P. Paris. Desclée de Brouwer et Cie. 1937. 2 Volumes.

To leave unfinished a work we love is a hard sacrifice. Père Mandonnet must have regarded this work highly, for it dealt with one whom he loved as a father and looked to as a guide. Moreover, the scope of the work lay within the field of his accurate historical studies, the thirteenth century. Père Vicaire, in his introduction to the first volume, insists that though much of the work is not from the pen of P. Mandonnet himself all of it is inspired by his ideals and in harmony with his researches.

The first part of the first volume, entitled *Saint Dominique*, is a reprint of a work of the same name as the present which P. Mandonnet published at Ghent in 1921 in the collection *Études religieuses*. This section has been annotated by P. Vicaire. Then follow six critical studies by P. Vicaire on various historical points contemporary with the matter of the first part. The second part again consists of a section by P. Mandonnet on the "activity of the members of the Order of Preachers." This is followed by two critical studies by the same writer.

The second volume contains less of P. Mandonnet's own work. The first part, "the mission of the Order of Preachers in the Church," is written by R. Ladner, O.P. Two short historical studies are from the pen of P. Mandonnet himself. The remainder of this volume, on "the rule of St. Augustine and that of St. Dominic," is partly by P. Mandonnet, partly by P. Vicaire. The early parts were worked out by the former before his death, the remainder existed only as notes and general plans. Certain passages, dictated by P. Mandonnet before his death, are marked as his work by the editors.

All of the sections indicated as completely done by P. Mandonnet have appeared in one or more magazines, mostly French. It will be seen from this that the work lacks a certain unity and logical coherence. But the editors could not have achieved these and still kept P. Mandonnet's work in the form in which he left it. GEORGE P. KLUBERTANZ.

Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857, edited by Dwight Lowell Dumond. New York. Appleton-Century Co. 1938. 2 Volumes. xiii + 1189. \$10.00.

During the recent Historical Convention in Chicago, W. B. Hesseltine, of the University of Wisconsin, read a paper entitled, "The Abolitionist Movement Reconsidered," from which we learn that perhaps Garrison, the Tappens and the Liberator group were not the unquestioned altruists previous historians have led us to believe. In discussing the paper, Theodore Clarke Smith of Williams College called attention to the pronounced trend of our American historians to attempt more accurate, more clearly defined pictures of movements in their re-evaluations. While we are indeed learning more facts about American History, the present reviewer believes it open to question whether we are thereby more able to use our new mountain of facts to interpret any more accurately. Probably in the case of the Abolitionist movement we are slowly approaching the truth of fact and losing sight of the spirit which permeated the movement.

Our generation has reversed decisions of our elders concerning the Civil War, and perhaps particularly with regard to the Abolitionists. Certainly, in great measure Garrison and his lieutenants have merited the disfavor into which they have fallen. Keepers of public morals, unbending rulers of men's consciences by petty standards artificially superimposed, blinded leaders of the blind, one wonders that the whole anti-Slavery Crusade could rally a following on what purported to be purely ethical grounds. The philanthropists who furnished the necessary funds, the enthusiastic masses, the supposedly enlightened converts might well be compared, in some measure, to the hypnotized believers who

today follow so enthusiastically the demagogues of Europe and America.

As one pages through the two volumes of Birney's Letters, the dominant characteristic of this prominent Abolitionist strikes the reader immediately. James Gillespie Birney was utterly sincere. He believed in Abolition with his whole soul. He dared all, sacrificed willingly that men might live as brothers. The quarter century of correspondence reveals, as certainly nothing else more clearly could, the sincere devotion of men to a cause whose justice they never questioned. In good report and evil report, the men with whom Birney corresponded remained steadfast to their ideal. Garrison may have shifted ground, rung the changes on women's rights, slavery, mysticism; but not Birney and his friends. Once Birney had pledged himself to Abolition, he never forsook his position. Such constant fidelity, such singleness of purpose reveals the breadth of a man as well as his depth. During twenty-six years in official and private communication James Birney never lost sight of his purpose. And among his friends are found many equally sincere believers in the Abolitionist movement. No mere amassing of minute facts will outweigh the sincerity of these men. We may "reconsider," and "reinterpret," but we will never erase such loyalty. Certainly hundreds of Abolitionists were true to their cause and proved their belief in deeds.

Dwight Lowell Dumond, Ph. D., editor of the Birney Letters, deserves praise for his work. He has not detracted from the Letters by confusing footnotes and lengthy explanations. After a brief introduction James Birney takes over and we are left to watch him and his friends struggle for their cause. The Letters are underwritten by the Beveridge Memorial Fund of the American Historical Association. JOSEPH P. DONNELLY.

The Sixteenth Century Italian Duel, by Frederick R. Bryson. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1938. pp. xxviii & 248. \$3.00.

War is a duel between nations; a duel is a war between individuals. As definitions these statements may be inadequate. At least, they bring out the relationship of one kind of combat to another. Lovers of peace have seen in the passing of one barbarian custom the promise of an eventual cessation of the other. At any rate, Professor Bryson has hit upon a topic of considerable intrinsic interest, a topic moreover which has not been overworked in the history of human perversity. In a well-documented study he sets forth the theories behind the changing practice of single combat. Opened at random, almost any page of the book makes easy reading. Still, it maintains a scholarly, judicious tone throughout. Source references hidden away somewhere at the end of the volume lose half their value. The too frequent use of "former" and "latter" is a bit exasperating.

Back in the Old Testament we have the deathless story of David and Goliath. Here was a duel which was at once a combat between two armies, an appeal to the judgment of God, and the avenging of an insult. These are the types of duel portrayed by the author: the duel of state, the judicial duel, and the duel of honor. In sixteenth century Italy, the duel of honor prevailed. Reason, law and religion were against it. The condemnation of the Council of Trent was apparently the most effective curb from the side of authority. But more effective still was the common sense which laughed this absurdity well nigh out of existence. Professor Bryson has centered his attention upon Italy in the sixteenth century, but his long approach and his several appendices make the book a fairly complete history of duelling.

R. CORRIGAN.

Secession and Restoration of Louisiana, by W. M. Caskey. Louisiana State University Press. 1938. pp. 318. \$3.50.

This is the first volume of two projected by Dr. Caskey to give a complete and authoritative history of Louisiana from her secession till her final restoration. The present volume includes approximately half of the story, from the election of Lincoln in 1860 to the New Orleans Riots, the "incident" which made Congressional Reconstruction in Louisiana possible. The author is intellectually a lineal descendant of the Dunning group, taught as he was by Fleming and Phillips. Hence one might expect his narrative to be open to the criticisms which have been levelled against the school which effectively re-wrote Reconstruction history. However, though a native son of Louisiana, Dr. Caskey is first the careful and objective historian. He has observed all the canons, used all the sources and produced a reliable work on his subject.

The subject of Reconstruction in any of the Southern States is necessarily difficult to present clearly. The march and counter march of parties and conventions, the military government

overlapping the civic, the negro and white conflict must all be sifted out and clarified. Then, too, the characters from Butler to Pinchback are none too attractive. The author has methodically arranged his evidence and carefully presented his conclusions in such a manner as to give a satisfactory, if not too interesting picture. He makes no attempt to portray, he writes objective history. Perhaps he wisely avoids using his dramatic opportunities, willing to risk losing interest for the sake of his cause.

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY.

El Gentilhombre Iñigo Lopez de Loyola en su Patria y en su Siglo, por el P. Pedro Leturia, S. J. Montevideo. Mosca Hermanos. 1938. pp. xvi & 303.

In July, 1936, this book was to have gone to press in Barcelona. It was actually published only a few months ago in Montevideo. Two crowded years, a war-torn country-side, a nation struggling for its soul account for the delay in time and the transfer to a distant and more peaceful place of publication. But surely, the soldier who fell in the defense of Pamplona, underwent a transformation of soul during long months of meditation and prayer, and emerged as a great captain in the army of Christ has lost none of his appeal for those who watch the rebirth of Spain in the counter-revolution. The spirit of Ignatius is the spirit of the finest fighters in the world today. Ignatius could naturally swing into stride with the singing soldiers of Navarre.

Much has been written about Ignatius Loyola. Pious and popular or severely scholarly, biographies of the saint have won for him affection sometimes, admiration always. His glory is augmented in no small way by the persistent attacks of his posthumous enemies. His record has had to stand the strong light of critical research. And now, we have a first-rate historian turning his hand to what is really a popular study done in the spirit of filial devotion. Illustrations (the best reproductions we have seen of the saint's actual features!) and generous quotations of Spanish poetry give the volume the appearance of light literature. Abundant footnote references, frequently to still unedited sources, reassure the more critical. The most interesting single chapter we found to be "Wartburg y Loyola," a parallel study of Saint Ignatius and Martin Luther, centering in the crucial years, 1521-1522.

R. CORRIGAN.

Constitutional History of Medieval England, by J. E. A. Joliffe. New York. Van Nostrand. 1937. pp. vii & 524.

Mr. Joliffe understands the importance of the medieval phase of constitutional development in England. It is no exaggeration to say that without a thorough knowledge and understanding of the Middle Ages one finds present-day English constitutional history all but unintelligible. The author is therefore to be commended for restricting himself to this period in the volume under review.

The treatment is very detailed in parts. Especially is this true of the chapters dealing with Saxon England. In such abundant detail, however, the slighting of essential facts becomes the more glaring. Why, for example, is there no reference to Saint Augustine and the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to the Catholic faith? To overlook the significant contribution of the Church to the development of England, and more specifically of the English constitution, betrays an inexcusable blindness to patent historical fact. In connection with the Feudal period the tenures of frankalmoign and of grand and petit serjeantry are not mentioned. These tenures were as important as knights-service, at least. The Magna Charta is poorly handled. This constitutional document may owe much to its modern interpreters. But the author dismisses it with unwarranted brevity. On the whole, this volume could be very much improved by proper division and subdivision. Five chapters are too few. A division of them into smaller sections would be an aid to clarity and proper emphasis. But the book was not intended to be a mere text book. It will be read with profit by advanced students who already know the main outlines of the story.

G. R. TORUÑO.

Inquisition and Liberty, by G. G. Coulton. William Heinemann, Ltd. London. 1938. pp. xiii + 354. Index.

Much of what is to be found in this book is based on Lea's *History of the Inquisition*, and many of the digressions and expressions of opinion are to be found in other works by Dr. Coulton, including his recently published *Medieval Panorama*. "I have attempted," he says, "to keep in view . . . the practical question of censorship and physical coercion as against freedom of thought" (p. xiii). This may be taken as a key to an under-

standing of the book. For Dr. Coulton the beginning of the long, sad history of persecution is to be discovered in the message of St. Leo to the Council of Chalcedon because the pope did not express himself sufficiently strongly in the matter of persecution for Priscillianism. However the words of St. Leo are printed (p. 26) with a fair commentary on the attitude of both Lea and Vacandard to these words. Many of the strictures against the medieval clergy that have appeared in other books by Dr. Coulton are here repeated. Typical of his attitude in this respect is his statement that when Gregory VII forbade the presence at mass of notoriously concubinary priests, "this did not purify the churches so much as it emptied them" (p. 47). He refers more than once to the "Totalitarian Religious State of the Middle Ages" and talks of the burning of heretics in the twelfth century as "lynch law" and "pogroms" (pp. 68 and 110). This is looking at the middle ages through modern spectacles with a vengeance. Not until the sixth chapter do we really get down to the Inquisition, but from that point all the horrors of persecution are paraded before us embellished with photographs of the "Dungeon and Chains at Carcassonne," "Fustigation for the Extraction of Evidence" and the like.

Yet Dr. Coulton has mellowed somewhat. He is not quite sure that the quarrels of orthodox and heretic may not find a parallel in the quarrels of an economic and political nature today. He admits in his *Epilogue* that "we must make allowance for the general principle of the Inquisition, though not for its excesses." The book is, like all Dr. Coulton's books, full of challenges. If these inspire the enquiring student to do the research that would be necessary before taking up the gage they will have served a noble purpose.

H. H. COULSON.

Cities in the Wilderness (1625-1742), by Carl Bridenbaugh. New York. The Ronald Press. 1938. pp. 500. \$5.00.

Those who have been dissatisfied with our reconstruction of colonial life may take a Roman holiday and revel in all the minutiae of colonial urban life, assured that their picture of the colonial town here presented is accurate. This is the sort of book which one dips into with pleasure or reads at a sitting. Five villages grow into great "cities" while the reader watches with expanding interest. The amount of careful research necessary to produce the book must have been prodigious. To ferret out colonial town life from "Tuesday Clubs" to fish markets is no small undertaking. But here it is, well written, amusing, and dependable.

The author has a thesis which he adroitly overlays with clever byplay. He believes that urban life in the Colonies had a far more important part in the development of our country than has hitherto been supposed. And after reading his book, one is ready to subscribe. Whether he agrees with his thesis or not, the reader will certainly have a clearer picture of colonial life. And the picture contains many surprises. Particularly is this true of the chapter on "Social Life in the Towns." Many a prairie "socialite" had a counterpart in earlier colonial ancestors with all their valiant effort at "culture and uplift." Alack for the "400." Once indeed it was but a travesty, an imitation of a better "400" in England, which the first American frontier attempted bravely to imitate. The reader will enjoy this book. Students will read it and teachers will enliven lectures from it. Withal it is a scholarly work, well written.

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY.

The Age of Reform, 1815-1870, by E. L. Woodward. Oxford. The Clarendon Press. 1938. pp. xviii & 656. \$6.00.

This is not the type of book which calls for enthusiastic comment. It is a presentation of good bread-and-butter history, a calm, objective survey of fifty-five years of momentous development of imperial Britain. The author spreads his account so as to embrace all departments of political, economic, social and religious life. Elsewhere, we have objected to the departmentalizing of activities which in the concrete working out of history were inseparable parts of a single unit. Abstracting for the moment from this regrettable feature, we can pronounce this volume an excellent piece of scholarly writing. Its inclusion in "The Oxford History of England" series gives it an added recommendation.

About two-thirds of the book is devoted to the political framework, domestic and foreign. In this section parliamentary reform bulks large. Relations with the Continent, the Near East, Ireland, India and the colonies are treated fully. A section of some two hundred pages deals with "reform" more specifically. Social life, religion, education, literature, the sciences and the arts are each accorded a special chapter. Mr. Woodward flirts with a tempta-

tion to emphasize industrial change,—as indeed it should be emphasized in any history of the mid-nineteenth century. He admits that religion, art and literature "may respond to needs more enduring than any manifestation of temporal power in the kingdoms of this world." But, he insists, "aspects of English life which do not draw their living force from politics" have to be fitted into the political framework of society. At least, we know what he considers most vital in history.

We cannot weep with Mr. Woodward over the collapse of European Liberalism after 1848. The forces which supplanted it, much as he dislikes them, were more dynamic, less diseased and just about as defensible on rational and ethical grounds. It is easy to agree with the conclusion: "For leisure or work, for getting or spending, England was a better country in 1870 than in 1815." There had been an age of reform in which the workers, the poor and the underprivileged generally had learned to build their hopes on "Progress," though they felt themselves still far from an earthly paradise.

R. CORRIGAN.

The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1800-1840, by William Wilson Manrose. New York. Columbia University Press. 1938. pp. 270. \$3.25.

This is number 441 of Columbia's "Studies in History, Economics and Public Law"; and the author, a Fellow and Tutor in the General Seminary, might list it as his fourth volume in the history of the Episcopal Church in America.

The book is an exquisite piece of scholarly workmanship, but a Catholic in its perusal feels that sense of wistful loneliness that comes upon him when visiting the cathedrals of England that have been despoiled of their tabernacles. Everything belonging to the externals of religion is here, but God is not.

L. J. KENNY.

A History of Third Parties in Pennsylvania, 1840-1860, by Sister M. Theophane Geary. Washington. Catholic University. 1938. pp. xi + 274.

The story of third parties and their influence in American politics forms a curious chapter in American history. Lacking the financial support enjoyed by the major parties, these smaller groups have turned to radical platforms in their efforts to enlist popular support. Third parties come and go with little chance of success, only to see their abandoned platforms later used by the major parties.

Sr. Theophane has made a thorough study of a very limited field. Subjects treated in her dissertation include the Anti-Masonic Party, the Liberty Party, Free Soil Agitation, and that currently popular field of historical investigation, Nativism. Out of the fusion of all these elements the author sees the birth of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania, the party which was to control the destinies of the state for over fifty years. The work is well documented and gives evidence of mature scholarship. The appendix includes a selection of party platforms.

EDWARD R. VOLLMAR.

History of Colombia, by Jesús María Henao and Gerardo Arrubla. Translated and edited by J. Fred Rippy. Chapel Hill. University of North Carolina Press. pp. xii + 578. \$5.00.

Quite recently Latin America has assumed a place of prominence in our foreign policy. The Congress at Lima was a big step toward a better understanding of our mutual relations and responsibilities. But we shall never be able to appreciate these fully unless we really know our southern neighbors and see what they have done. This *History of Colombia* helps us to do just that. It is a volume that has much to recommend it. First of all, it is a history of Colombia by Colombians. Consequently it has that native point of view which even the best foreign writer cannot grasp. Then, it was a prize-winning, accepted high-school text. It was chosen as the best history of Colombia by the editors of the Inter-American Historical Series. And last, and far from least, it has as its translator and editor, J. Fred Rippy, who deserves considerable commendation for his fine work.

Professor Rippy has omitted some of the less important chapters of the bulky, two volumes of Spanish text, and has condensed some of the more or less irrelevant matter in the remaining chapters. Besides this the editor has added a concluding chapter, bringing the story of the Colombian Republic up to date.

The history of the country from the time of its conquest by the Spaniards, through the Wars of Independence and the establishment of the national state down to the Colombian-Peruvian

boundary dispute of 1934 is interestingly and accurately portrayed. There are a few inaccuracies here and there, such as the statement that St. Peter Claver was a *brother* coadjutor of the Society of Jesus. He was a *spiritual* coadjutor.

For the Catholic historian it is refreshing to find the Church, somewhere at least, considered an integral part of a nation's life. The translator forestalls any criticism on the lack of footnotes by explaining that most of them would necessarily be to Spanish texts. The bibliography makes up for this. The glossary of Spanish official words aids considerably toward a proper understanding of the history.

MARTIN HASTING.

The Syndical and Corporative Institutions of Italian Fascism, by G. Lowell Field. New York. Columbia University Press. 1938. pp. 209. \$2.75.

The European scene has been shifting so swiftly that one would expect any book on Fascism to be quickly outmoded. Dr. Field, however, has gotten around the difficulty of treating a dynamic governmental policy by pegging those particular phases of Fascism which promise to endure. In his introduction the author wisely limits his treatise when he says: "No evaluation is attempted of the Fascist social system as an operating whole. Instead attention is here concentrated upon an analysis of the distinctive governmental mechanisms of the Fascist state both in their formal public law aspects and also, within the limitations of available material, with respect to their actual functioning."

The author has divided his work into three parts: the Dictatorship, the Official Syndicates, the Corporative Institutions; and he discusses each, more or less cursorily, from both structural and functional aspects. In the first part, on the Italian dictatorship, he leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader regarding the formal and legal authoritarianism of the Italian government. Dictatorship is to be the permanent mode of control in Italy even when the present incumbent passes from the picture. Theoretically, the King is authorized "to appoint and remove the Head of the Government," which was the case with the former parliamentary prime minister.

The second division of the book treats the state control of labor relations through governmental syndical bodies vested with the exclusive legal representation of capital and labor. Dr. Field's sojourn in Italy enabled him to check closely the theory and practice of the Syndicates. The third part discusses the Corporations, which loosely combine the different official syndicates of capital and labor, and which exercise some control over the economic activities of Italy. The whole work is well arranged and well documented, but the reader is cautioned against assuming that this Italian political system is synonymous with the organic and corporative system outlined in the papal encyclicals. The mistake is made only too often by those who have studied neither the Italian theory nor the Papal theory.

JOSEPH H. FICHTER.

History of Ancient Civilization, by Albert A. Trever, Volume II, *The Roman World*. New York. Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1939. pp. xvi + 817. \$4.00.

This book is the second installment of a two volume work intended as a text for college students. The first volume, *The Ancient Near East and Greece*, which appeared in 1936, carried the narrative to the end of Hellenistic times, and the present volume covers the period of Roman history from the earliest days to the death of Constantine. The book is well, though not brilliantly written, and makes good use of all the most recent researches and findings. The author has attempted an integrated picture of Roman civilization with a sufficient narrative of political events, a description of economic and social conditions, and a proper emphasis of cultural, religious, and philosophical elements constituting this civilization. With qualifications we might say he has succeeded.

Two unusual points about this book are the exceptionally large place devoted to the Empire as compared with the Republic, and the more extensive treatment of the development of Christianity under the Roman Empire. The former feature either limits or enhances the value of the book according to the point of view. If the college course is intended largely as "background" for classical studies, the dismissal of the whole period of development from 753 to 265 in fifty pages is a drawback. If the Roman history course is intended to be introductory to Medieval history, this feature is commendable.

With regard to the author's view of Roman Christianity we must strongly object. His attitude towards the Church as an institution is, on the whole, favorable, but we think he could be more selective in his choice of "authorities" in his studies of the "evolution" of Christianity. His favorite "authority" is Guigne-

bert, whose treatment is "rationalistic." To him "Jesus" is not the "Christ" but only a simple (but good!) peasant Rabbi "apotheosized" in the course of time by devout tradition and interpretation. The book is written in a clear easy style, fortified with examples drawn from contemporary writings. The danger here is that examples drawn from Juvenal and Tacitus may be too vivid to be typical. The book is enriched with many excellent illustrations, many fine maps, charts, and tables all of which are more than usually well-chosen. The bibliography is extensive and carefully prepared, the list of translations of contemporary literature being especially valuable.

R. L. PORTER.

The Negro, Too, in American History, by Merl R. Eppse. Chicago. National Educational Publishing Co. 1938. pp. xxi + 544. \$3.00.

The author of this book has accomplished a pioneer-work with the usual advantages and disadvantages of the trail-blazer. The part which the Negro has played should have been told long ago; and yet probably it can be told only now, when the white-hot embers of post Civil War antagonisms have happily smoldered into the ashes of forgetfulness. For it is the story of a race whose course was run through sad years of slavery and cheerless years of poverty following upon emancipation. But through it all there can be seen the cheerful hope so characteristic of the Negro race. If it be a story, at times, of weakness and inevitable ignorance, it is also a saga of patience and courage. Throughout his narrative the author shows a remarkable balance of judgment and generous vision that readily win the reader's confidence. Varying economic conditions and their results upon the Negro are discussed as well as the Negro's attitude toward religion. This latter discussion however, is marred by a too vague and shadowy concept of Christianity. Several interesting statistical appendices together with an index and selected bibliography for each chapter complete the volume.

There are, however, a few minor errors, and at times the author is more patriotic than historical. Unfortunately, practically no references are given. This concession to the casual reader is disappointing to the critical historian. It is annoying to be left in ignorance of the source of interesting data which entailed, undoubtedly, painstaking research. On the whole the book should prove very helpful to every reader whether historian or not. To have read this long neglected chapter of the Epic of America is to have obtained a more complete picture of America and a wider vision both of what has been and what can be. The work is undoubtedly well worth reading.

L. J. DALY.

Islam, by Henri Massé. Translated from the French by Halidé Edib. New York. Putnam's Sons. 1938. pp. x + 270. \$2.50.

In this book, "a sketch of the historical evolution of Islam," the author has given us a mine of factual information, but in attempting to cover such a vast field in so short a space he has beaten out some of the matter so thin as to make it unintelligible, and at times even misleading. This is especially true of the last chapter which attempts in forty-two pages to treat the various non-Arab hegemonies of Islam from the eleventh century to the present day. However, the other five chapters are, on the whole, truly admirable pieces of summary and outline. The style is terse and almost telegraphic. The chapters have good sub-headings, which, for a manual, could have been printed in a more prominent and helpful manner. There is no bibliography (at least in the English translation), and all the references to specialists are made in the text without citation of book or page. All of the footnote references are to the Koran or Bible, the frequent citation of the former being very helpful. The authorities most frequently referred to are Gaudetroy Denombynes, Golziher, and especially the Jesuit scholar, Père Lammens, who seems to be followed in most disputed points. On the whole, for a brief explanation of the historical evolution of Islam, and for a brief exposition of its dogmas and sects, this book would be a valuable addition to the historical library which has few or none of the more extensive (and usually untranslated) French and German works.

R. L. PORTER.

Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages, by Étienne Gilson. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1938. pp. vii + 114. \$1.50.

The contents of this book were delivered by Professor Gilson as the Richards Lectures for 1937, at the University of Virginia. Unfortunately, the "dust jacket" states that the aim of the book is to show that the first, or Greek Period of the history of

philosophy was the golden age of pure reason; the second, or Medieval Period was a time when reason was dominated and obscured by faith in Christian revelation; and the third, or Modern Period has again restored reason to its rightful ascendancy. This is diametrically opposed to the real aim of Professor Gilson. He intends not to support, but to criticize and correct by a sound philosophy of history based on actual facts, this commonly received yet erroneous opinion. Here, he concerns himself only with the second period.

In an easy, flowing style, the author traces the three predominant trends of thought in the Middle Ages. The first, supported by Augustine, Anselm, and their thirteenth century followers, emphasized the absolute insufficiency of reason, unless it be sustained by the light of revelation. The second trend, championed especially by the Arabian philosopher, Averroës, made reason supreme and religious faith a substitute for pure reason, necessary only in order to convince the imaginative multitude. The problem was finally solved by St. Thomas Aquinas, who pointed out that there can never be any real conflict between reason and revelation, because assent from faith and assent from reason are two specifically different kinds of assent to truth. It is important that the modern historian realize this accepted Catholic view, namely, that philosophy and theology are distinct sciences, yet philosophy can never operate with complete success, except in the atmosphere of revealed truth.

Professor Gilson has shown masterly skill in handling historical material to support his theory, especially in his use of Averroës. He traces modern rationalism back not merely to the scientific renaissance of sixteenth century Italy, but to a much earlier and purely philosophical rationalism begun by Averroës in the twelfth century. Moreover, he points out that the sincere historian must not fail to consider these facts, if he wishes to present a true and complete account of the genealogy of modern rationalism.

J. W. NAUGHTON.

Lafayette, by W. E. Woodward. New York. Farrar and Rinehart. 1938. pp. xii + 472. \$3.50.

"Seeker after glory" might well be the sub-title of *Lafayette*. Bored with life in France the young marquis seized the opportunity for fame offered by the American Revolution. His actual value to the American cause is difficult to estimate; the publicity resulting from his presence in America was probably his chief contribution. Despite his youth and inexperience Lafayette rewarded Washington's confidence by showing evidence of military ability, standing high above many of the foreign officers who gave the American commander so much grief. It seems unfortunate in the light of his after years that Lafayette did not remain in America. But he was French and he desired glory in France.

As commander of the National Guard and virtually dictator, Lafayette was the strongest man in France after October 6, 1789, but the flight of the king in June, 1791, proved his undoing. With his withdrawal from the Jacobins began the decline of his power, to culminate in his flight from France and arrest by the allies in 1792. There was little glory left after that except for some useless opposition to Napoleon, and the brief triumphal tour of the United States, 1824-1825, during which Lafayette was the toast of the nation.

The best part of the book is not that dealing with Lafayette, but the chapters summarizing the early years of the French Revolution. It should, however, be pointed out that the difficulty of the clergy was not caused principally by the confiscation of the Church property, but by the *Civil Constitution*.

There is little that is new in the book. It is written in a popular and very readable style. The bibliography is rather meagre and limited chiefly to secondary sources. The value of the work is enhanced by a number of well chosen illustrations and an excellent index.

EDWARD R. VOLLMAR.

The Rise of George Canning, by Dorothy Marshall. New York. Longmans, Green. 1938. pp. xviii + 310. \$5.00.

Most of the full length portraits of George Canning have been focused on the political achievements of his mature years to the almost complete exclusion of his early training and private life. Failure to supply an adequate picture of the future prime minister in the chrysalis stage must be ascribed primarily to the insufficiency of material rather than to deliberate neglect on the part of his biographers. Miss Marshall was fortunate in having access to a mass of hitherto unpublished private papers which include a diary covering his first two years in Parliament and a large amount of his confidential correspondence. Skillfully weaving together copious extracts from these papers and other letters,

she presents a fascinating story of the subject's youthful career told for the most part in his own words.

Rescued while still a child from destitution and the evil influence of a dissolute foster father, Canning was reared in the congenial and cultural atmosphere of his uncle's household. Here he made the acquaintance of Fox and Sheridan who prevailed upon his guardian to send him to Eton and Oxford. The undergraduate's marked ability as a writer and orator led these and other Whig leaders to see in him the rising hope of their party. They were doomed to disappointment for shortly after returning to London Canning aligned himself with the Tories. This abrupt change in political creed, as is evidenced from his letters, was due less to his growing distrust of Revolutionary principles than to his mounting admiration for Burke and Pitt. It was under the latter's tutelage that he made his political apprenticeship and formed the principles of statecraft to which he adhered throughout life.

In this interesting study no attempt is made to disguise or explain away the English statesman's defects such as his brutal satirization of Addington and the childish petulance he manifested at Pitt's resignation. On the other hand, new and powerful light is thrown on a character notable for personal moral integrity, singular independence of judgment and unswerving loyalty to friends.

CLARENCE J. RYAN.

Europe Since 1914, by F. Lee Benms. New York. Crofts. 1939. pp. xiv & 933. \$3.00.

In the HISTORICAL BULLETIN for November, 1936, we recommended this volume wholeheartedly. Not final and not flawless, it does present a panoramic view of external events which will satisfy both readers and writers of our daily news service. *Europe Since 1914* was first published in 1930. We now have the fourth edition. Will the fifth edition have to record a gigantic upheaval in the presence of which the story of the past quarter of a century will shrivel into comparative unimportance? Or will the author be able to go on with his unchanged title, adding details of more or less the same general character? One may express the pious hope that Professor Benms may sense a rising demand for something more than mere surface history. Here, he gives us a useful, orderly account of domestic and international politics which too many people regard as the whole of history. In this, we prefer him to the "new history" fadists. But we are utopian enough to cherish the dream of a history that is not satisfied with skimming, perhaps we should say scraping, the surface.

The educated man of today should know what Professor Benms is trying to teach him. But if he fails to penetrate to the reality beyond and behind armaments, economic rivalries and crooked diplomacy, he will miss something more vital than mere factual erudition. To be specific, the author would seem to regard the Concordat and Treaty of the Lateran as the greatest achievement of Pius XI. But after all, was this not essentially a means to more important ends, which are the primary care of the pope? Again, Communist Russia fills a big place on the stage of political and economic affairs. But there is a fallacy and a danger in overstressing tractors, dynamos and blood purges to the neglect of the tragedy of souls under atheistic Communism. Forms of government are of interest to all of us. General welfare, which is the purpose of government, should be of greater interest. But ignoring the purpose of human existence distorts any view of history or of life.

R. CORRIGAN.

The United States and Santo Domingo, 1798-1873: A Chapter in Caribbean Diplomacy, by Charles Callan Tansill. Baltimore. John Hopkins Press. 1938. pp. ix + 487. \$3.50.

The sub-title of this volume might easily be changed to read, *A Very Interesting Chapter in Caribbean Diplomacy Well Done*. For this scholarly study of the Dominican incident, by Professor Tansill, is an important contribution to American diplomatic history.

The story of our relations with Santo Domingo is an excellent key not only to the diplomatic policies of our government during three-quarters of a century, but also to the domestic political ideas and ideals of the various presidential incumbents and their contemporaries. Adams courted the favor of England by acting in concert with her in the affairs in Haiti; Jefferson lent his influence to France. Filmore and Webster almost drove the English ambassador and Foreign Secretary to distraction by their dilatoriness in dealing with the problem; Grant and Fish did the same by their energetic support of Dominican annexation.

Besides the outline of the rise and fall of the American imperialistic temper and the influence of lobbying capitalists and speculators, Professor Tansill gives us a few interesting sidelights on the personal relations of statesmen, some rather amusing mutual evaluations of the American and foreign diplomatic corps, and the romantic story of those "rascals," Cazneau, Fabens, and their associates.

An occasional obscure statement or reference may be due to the fact that the work presupposes a fairly accurate knowledge of Dominican history. The abundance of primary materials, well handled, indicates long and careful research. The book will be an excellent guide to further studies of our diplomatic history.

MARTIN HASTING.

Flight Into Oblivion, by Alfred Jackson Hanna. Richmond, Virginia. Johnson Publishing Company. 1938. pp. xiii + 306. \$2.75.

Flight Into Oblivion has the title and appearances of a book of poetry and is as adventurous as a dime novel. Yet it is good history. It traces the flight of the Confederate Cabinet from the fall of Richmond through the Southern States into Cuba and England. Professor Hanna of Rollins College is well qualified by Southern birth and training to treat this gripping episode of American History. His teaching career and his familiarity with the topography of the Southern regions through which the Confederate Cabinet made their escape equip him to combine historical technique and local color into a dramatic narrative. Previous to the publication of this volume, several articles bearing on this topic had appeared, but, now, for the first time we have a complete story which has been garnered from original source material not previously available. The hairbreadth escapes of John C. Breckenridge, Confederate Secretary of War, and of Judah P. Benjamin, Secretary of State, through the fingers of alert Federals, form the basis for the most adventurous portions of the volume. The later career of the Cabinet, which the author calls "oblivion," is indicated in passing, and supplies the finishing touches to his story.

After reading the story, however, we are conscious of several lacunae. Had the members of the Confederate Cabinet left complete flight-logs, Professor Hanna would not have had to fill in several intervals between historical incidents, of which he has record, with numerous details of local color. To hold his readers, the author has undoubtedly used his imagination, for instance on page 182 we read: "Suddenly the weather became thick and squally, the sea rose as the heavy rain fell with increasing strength. Lightning flashed in terrifying silver streams as the tempest howled, and the constant cracking of their small craft made them fear it would be dashed to pieces at any moment. . . ." While such passages add to the narrative and bring dead facts to life, they smack of fiction. If this last statement seems damaging, this is beyond the reviewer's intention. By bringing the distant past closer to home, the author has written "popular history" but he has not distorted his facts. The illustrations by John Rae, also a member on the teaching staff of Rollins College, enliven the book, and the maps aid us in following the Cabinet members through the "underground passages," the plantations, swamps and rivers in Georgia and Florida. The book is well documented with footnotes, and the bibliography invites further study.

GEORGE McHUGH.

The United States Since 1865, by Louis M. Hacker and Benjamin B. Kendrick. Third edition. New York. F. S. Crofts. 1939. pp. xxiv & 821. \$3.75.

An enthusiastic review of this excellent, widely used text book, in the HISTORICAL BULLETIN, XVI, 58, termed it "an encyclopedia, covering every phase of American life up to date, in one volume!", "a work of which the publishers, the printers, and above all the authors may be justly proud." On our part, we just as enthusiastically hail this third edition and ninth printing with its revised, corrected, daring, and up-to-date treatment of the "Golden Twenties," the Depression, and the New Deal. The revision covers some two hundred pages. A number of new and helpful charts are given; especially good are those on prices, business and banking. At the close of the volume, a tentative critique of the New Deal labels it "an experiment in state capitalism." It is also "largely a political rather than an economic plan."

N. P. LOEHR.

Bravery, conquest, luxury, anarchy—such is the fatal circle of the history of every empire.—G. G. Walsh.